

COLLEGE STUDY & COLLEGE LIFE

BERNARD C. EWER

LIBRARY OF EDUCATIONAL METHODS



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

GIFT OF
Dr. Waldemar Westergaard

Dear W. S. Terzaard,

This is a
small but sincere expres-
sion of very large and pro-
found personal regard.

Bernard C. Ewer



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

COLLEGE STUDY & COLLEGE LIFE

BY

BERNARD C. EWER

PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION
POMONA COLLEGE



BOSTON: RICHARD G. BADGER
TORONTO: THE COPP CLARK CO., LIMITED

COPYRIGHTED, 1917, BY RICHARD G. BADGER

All Rights Reserved

Made in the United States of America

The Gorham Press, Boston, U.S.A.

PREFACE

The following pages have been written for the purpose of helping students to take a thoughtful view of college practices and college problems. Their contents consists mainly of facts and discussions which I have been accustomed to present to freshmen with regard to the aims and methods of college study and the various features of college life. It is manifestly desirable that newcomers to the campus should gain an intelligent appreciation of their educational situation, and if my experience is typical they are almost uniformly grateful for assistance in this respect. The well thumbed condition of those volumes in the college library which deal intimately with student interests testifies to the utility of such efforts, and constitutes encouragement to add another volume to those which appear to be so acceptable.

In view of the fact that many colleges are making use of such literature in the first year work of their departments of English, and even in special courses of instruction for freshmen, I have endeavored to facilitate this practice by presenting subjects somewhat in textbook form. In dealing with controversial questions such as occasionally produce tension in the college atmosphere I have tried not only to register my own opinion, but to present both sides of the controversy fairly.

The general aim of the college seems to me to be that of developing intellectual power, wise leadership, a habit of cooperation with associates and a spirit of friendliness toward all. I hope that these chapters may help in the realization of this aim.

It is a pleasure to add that the preparation of them has been greatly facilitated by my wife's interest and assistance.

BERNARD C. EWER.

Claremont, California,
September 1, 1917.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	3
 CHAPTER	
✓ I. THE COLLEGE PROBLEM	9
<i>Is College Education Profitable, 9—Certain Defects in Student Life, 11—The Study of the College Situation, 13.</i>	
II. THE EARLY AMERICAN COLLEGE	17
<i>Colonial College Foundations, 17—Social Conditions, 20—The Curriculum, 23.</i>	
III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION	29
<i>Expansion, 29—The Development of the Curriculum, 32—Social Development, 35.</i>	
IV. SPECIAL DEVELOPMENTS	40
<i>The Small College, 40—The State University, 42—Higher Education for Women, 46.</i>	
V. THE PURPOSE OF THE COLLEGE	49
<i>The Meaning of Education, 49—College Education, 51—Cultural and Practical Education, 53.</i>	
VI. THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM	58
<i>Fields of Study, 58—Science and Appreciation, 60—Science in the Curriculum, 62—Appreciative Studies in the Curriculum, 65.</i>	
VII. THE INDIVIDUAL PLAN OF STUDY	70
<i>Required Studies, 70—The Elective System, 72—Breadth and Specialization, 76.</i>	
✓ VIII. GENERAL CONDITIONS OF STUDY	80
<i>Amount, 80—Regularity, 84—Freedom, 87.</i>	

CHAPTER

PAGE

IX. ELEMENTARY FACTORS OF STUDY 91

Interest, 91—Attention, 93—Memory, 96.

X. THOUGHT FACTORS OF STUDY 99

Advanced Study Involves Thinking, 99—Purposiveness, 101—Analysis and Note Taking, 103—Supplementary Thinking, 107.

XI. SCHOLARSHIP 110

Are College Students Unscholarly? 110—The Motives of Scholarship, 112—Grades, 115.

XII. STUDENT HONESTY 121

Prevalent Conditions, 121—The Honor System, 123—Practical Considerations, 127.

XIII. HEALTH 131

Fundamental Importance of Health, the Health Problem, 131—Practical Principles, 134—Special Needs in Student Life, 136.

✓XIV. COLLEGE LIFE 141

Development, 141—Educational Value, 142—Excess, The Problem of Regulation, 146.

XV. COLLEGE SPIRIT 149

What Is "College Spirit"? 149—Needed Forms of College Spirit, 151—Custom and Conformity, 154—Hazing, Class Antagonisms, 156.

XVI. STUDENT GOVERNMENT 161

The Development of the Problem, 161—Training for Democracy, 163—Principles of Student Government, 165—Self-Government and Freedom, 169.

✓XVII. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS 170

Origin and Development, The Problem, 170—The Value of Intercollegiate Athletics, Benefits and Evils, 172—Regulation, 179—Professionalism, 183.

XVIII. FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES 187

Origin and Development, 187—The Value of the Fraternity, 190—Fraternity Evils, 192—Regulation, 195.

CONTENTS

7

CHAPTER	PAGE
XIX. COLLEGE RELIGION	199
<i>The Religious Characters of the College, 199—College Chapel, 201—The True Faith, 204.</i>	
APPENDIX A. THE OFFER OF THE COLLEGE, HYDE, <i>The Col- lege Man and the College Woman</i>	209
APPENDIX B. CHOOSING A VOCATION	210
APPENDIX C. TWO VOCATIONAL AIMS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS	212
APPENDIX D. GENERAL READING	215
APPENDIX E. FROM A CARD OF ADVICE TO STUDENTS IN THE LIBRARY OF BROWN UNIVERSITY	221
APPENDIX F. CONSTITUTION OF THE STUDENT COUNCIL OF X— COLLEGE	223
APPENDIX G. THE CREED OF A COLLEGE CLASS, HYDE, <i>The College Man and the College Woman</i>	226

COLLEGE STUDY AND COLLEGE LIFE

CHAPTER I

THE COLLEGE PROBLEM

Is College Education Profitable?

In the autumn of every year an enthusiastic army of young men and young women enter American colleges. Averaging nineteen years of age, graduates of public high schools and private academies, they are physically and mentally on the threshold of manhood and womanhood. With respect to intelligence, capability and promise of success they are among the best youth of the country—select candidates for “higher education.”

They enter an institution of dignified lineage and lengthy history, an organization of great and growing complexity, a place of much learning, diversified study, and highly specialized social arrangements. Breathing its peculiar intellectual and social atmosphere they pass through the freshman year, becoming sophomores, juniors, seniors, and at last graduates, proud of their Alma Mater. Eventually they go forth into society with the stamp of the college upon them; to a greater or less extent they are personifications of its character. In some measure their success or failure is determined by their college course. From the happenings, the tasks, the things done or not done during these four years results their worthfulness or worthlessness in society. Next to the home the school—and this means for the young people whom we are consid-

ing the college—is the most important formative institution in their lives. Is its influence upon them good or bad?

On the one hand we note the enthusiasm of the students themselves, the tremendous increase of attendance, and the sacrifice which thousands of parents are making for their children. All this is the expression of faith that collegiate education is worth while. We note also the assurance of college authorities, presidents, deans and professors, that the college years are advantageous in the highest degree. We learn that the college-educated two or three per cent of the population hold nearly half of the most important positions of trust. And finally we hear the testimony of men, some or them men of distinction, who have been compelled to educate themselves without college experience, that they have felt the lack of this constantly throughout their lives.¹

On the other hand we see considerable foolishness, snobbery, and general futility of behavior among college students. We find them dallying with subjects of study which have little direct relation to life, and dallying hardly less with subjects which have much. We hear an ever increasing volume of criticism, both from within and from without the college walls. It is said that a college course fails to develop good mental and moral habits, while it engenders many bad ones; that it consists of four years of sloth and dissipation, cheerfully masked by genial comradeship and good manners; that it sends out its youth into a work-a-day world untrained for any serious occupation. More pointedly we are told that college graduates cannot spell, cannot keep appointments, cannot sacrifice the pleasure of attending a football game for the duty of attending to business, and so on. When we point to the preeminence of college men in important positions, the reply is that the natural ability of these few would have placed them there in any case; and this assertion is

¹One of the most influential leaders of the educational and religious life of the nation says that he has never been able to overcome a feeling of embarrassment in not having had a college education.

supported by the long list of names of great men, from Columbus and Michelangelo to Herbert Spencer and Abraham Lincoln, who have illuminated history without having attended a university. Our higher educational institutions, it is said, suppress the individuality of the student; they "iron out" his promising excrescences of ability, and make him conform monotonously to traditional thought and established social types.

Such accusations are no doubt overdrawn. The good and the bad in human institutions are so mixed that it is easy to exaggerate the bad until it seems to cast a shadow over the whole. The effect of college training is mostly good; the defects are as a rule not profound, certainly not fatal. A large majority of college graduates go through life better in health, morals, citizenship, and efficiency than they would have done without those four years of higher education.

Nevertheless those who continue to hold this faith that a college education is well worth while must acknowledge that the criticism, however exaggerated, is not wholly untrue. Only a blind loyalty can ignore the fact that many students show no serious purpose, that some form bad habits, and that there are college graduates who are pitiable failures in life. Others are saved from failure only by inherited wealth, friendly sinecures, and disguised charity of various forms. Testimony is abundant that the process of adjustment to life after leaving college is difficult, often painful. Why is this so?

Certain Defects in Student Life

The first to be mentioned, possibly the fundamental one, is the lack of a serious, self-educative purpose. Too often the student has no clear conception of why he is spending four years of his most valuable youth in college. Such a purpose is not to be understood as a mere expectation of becoming a lawyer or merchant after graduation; this vague idea may amount to nothing whatever. It means a deliberate desire to do something useful among one's fellow men, and to prepare for it studiously, so that the college course is energized by this larger interest of life.

From the outset the student should face this problem. Though it is not desirable that every incoming freshman should have decided upon his life work, it is well that he should be thinking about the matter. Generally speaking, he should decide by the time he reaches junior standing what bent he will follow, and should regard his later college years as a broad educational preparation for this. When, as recently happened, in a prominent college, half the graduating class, men from twenty-one to twenty-five years of age, do not know what their vocations are to be, critics are justified in saying that the college does not square with life, and that its education is a waste of time.²

The second defect is the lack of skillful study method, the lack of efficiency in the learning process. We hear much about the small amount of study in college, but the real defect is one of quality rather than quantity. What is needed is not additional hours of "grinding," so much as an intelligent method of attacking and analyzing a study problem, of obtaining and weighing evidence, of comparing opinions and reaching a conclusion. The college student ordinarily needs to train himself in attention, in remembering and forgetting, in thinking and reasoning. This training implies less day dreaming in class and out, less wasting of time with a book when the mind is pre-occupied with a football or a girl, less accumulation of scrappy, unread notes, more regular hours, a more punctilious accuracy of speech. A contemporary critic of college affairs emphasizes the need in American life of "problem-solvers," i.e., of men who can deal skilfully with our varied economic, political, and moral problems, men who can investigate the perplexities of banking, railroad management, constitutional law, journalism, church efficiency, and

²"The fundamental fault of our whole educational system is that we try to train to superficial scholarship and conventional culture those who should be learning to do their share of the world's work." J. McKeen Cattell.

"To take a young man away from work, say at eighteen years of age, and keep him from useful labor, in the name of education, for four years, will some day be regarded as a most absurd proposition. Isolation from the world in order to prepare for the world's work is folly." Elbert Hubbard.

the like. For such problem-solving a correct method of study is absolutely requisite.³

In the third place the student gives too much time and attention to the distracting interests of college life, and more especially to its play. No doubt play is as vital an interest as is work, but a state of affairs has come to pass such that college play not only interferes with college work, but is taken so seriously that the proper spirit of play is lost, and it tends to become vicious. There is in student life an extensive and chaotic confusion of athletic and social performances which infringes from all sides upon the time, and still more upon the attention and interest of the student body.⁴ Many a college has scores of groups of one sort or another, some for intellectual or artistic purposes, others purely social and recreational. A single student may be a member of a dozen or more. The result of this excessive organization is a nervous, superficial, and often frivolous habit of life that produces little real happiness and no real power. Many persons regard the rational control of "college life" as the great central problem of college reform.

The Study of the College Situation

Most freshmen are but vaguely informed about the aims and ideals of the college. Its life is so different from previous school life, even from the boarding school life which mimics it, that many do not understand the institution or their own relation to it. Sent hither by parents, attracted by spectacular athletics, or carried in by the sheer momentum of our educational system, they rarely face the new conditions and opportunities with mature intelligence.

During the opening weeks of the year the attitude of the newcomer is a kind of confused docility, which gradu-

³ Bird's-eye, *Individual Training in Our College*, Chap. XXXIV.

⁴ "The side-shows are so numerous, so diverting—so important, if you will—that they have swallowed up the circus, and those who perform in the main tent must often whistle for their audiences, discouraged and humiliated." Woodrow Wilson, *What Is a College For?* *Scribner's Magazine*, Nov., 1909.

ally gives way to self assurance and perhaps bumptiousness. He gains the feeling of being at home in college, and this is among the most important acquisitions of the year. As time passes, his center of gravity may prove to be intellectual, so that college means to him primarily his desk and his books, the library, the class room and the laboratory; or it may be found in his social self, as he inhabits the fraternity house and athletic field, and becomes known for physical prowess and good fellowship. But in any case he quickly becomes acquainted with college life. This acquaintance, however, is not so much an intelligent comprehension, as it is a complex practical attitude toward his environment—a general manner of behavior. He picks it up by imitation of older students, gathers it in conversation with his friends, collects a few details from a talk by the president or dean, and gleans a good deal from the college newspaper. College customs seem to "soak in" rather than to impress themselves upon the intelligence. Loyalty, enthusiasm, "swagger," this burst of approval and that jab of criticism, are imitative and infectious. Often he does things not because he knows them to be best—he may even know that they are not best—but because he feels the force of custom around him. If a particular course of study has the reputation of being easy he proceeds to take it easily, without pausing to consider its possible advantages. If the college is traditionally given to foolish pranks he lends his energy to these. On the other hand he develops the soundest qualities of human character, courage, helpfulness, ability for organization, under the same social stimulus. So in the course of the year he possesses himself of a mixture of truth and error about his college and his membership in it. Practically he becomes wise in such matters of college interest as sports and social relationships, but as a rule he remains ignorant of what it is all for. He does not understand the function of the college, and his own reflective ideals develop slowly. When one asks him about the significance of the college for American life, or its relation to the surrounding community, or its preparation for citizenship, one too frequently finds that he has not

thought much on these subjects.

Yet it is profoundly true that every college student is part of a great historical movement. When he enters college he necessarily launches into a vast current of human thought and feeling and effort which bears him along, but to which he also contributes the force of his own personality. His studies, his recreations, in fact all the intellectual and social features of college life come to him from the past; and the future direction of the current depends in some slight degree upon his reaction to these conditions. He is a real factor in the developing educational system of the country, and in consequence a factor in the development of our national life.

Is it not desirable, therefore, that college men and women should make a serious study of the history, methods and practices, the purposes and ideals of higher education? Ought they not to acquire, at the beginning of the college course, an intelligent view of the institution to which they belong? This may be done in various ways: by special instruction, by general reading, by including appropriate material in regular courses, especially the first year English. But in one way or another it would seem that students might make with much profit to themselves, a scholarly acquaintance with the college. They are approaching manhood and womanhood in years and mental power; correspondingly it appears fitting that they should gain a mature appreciation of their educational environment. The result would surely be less floundering and waste of time, less folly and futility, a more determined purpose in college and in subsequent life.

It is not to be expected, of course, that the defects of contemporary college life can be wholly eradicated by the simple device of instruction. Wise counsel often slides off the mind without leaving any impression, and here as elsewhere study discipline may be evaded. Presumably intelligent students exhibit deafness to advice and warning, and blindness to the consequences of shirking—apparently anxious only to get along with a minimum of work and to have a good time. The wayward will is sometimes guided only by hard experience, and not always

by that. But most students, I think, desire to do the right thing if it is made clear. Accordingly it is reasonable to expect that the general effect of acquiring clear ideas about college life will be more earnestness, less childishness, a better study plan and method, and a greater willingness to cooperate in realizing the ideal of the college as a higher educational institution.

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY AMERICAN COLLEGE

Colonial College Foundations

In 1636, only a few years after the settlement of Boston, the General Court or legislature of the "Bay Colony" of Massachusetts appropriated four hundred pounds for the establishment of a "Schoole or Colledge."¹ The site chosen was at Newtowne, subsequently called Cambridge after the English seat of learning. Two years later John Harvard, a local clergyman, bequeathed his library and several hundred pounds in money to the infant institution, and in recognition of his generosity the college took his name.

For over half a century Harvard College remained the only institution of the kind in the country. In 1693 the College of William and Mary was established at Williamsburg, Virginia; and in 1701 in the colony of Connecticut a "Collegiate School," which after several years of troubled migration from one town to another was located at New Haven, and was named after one of its benefactors, Eli Yale. In many respects Yale was an offshoot of Harvard, founded and conducted largely by Harvard graduates, and administered in much the same way as the parent college. Similarly Princeton, founded in 1746 as the College of New Jersey, was patterned after Yale. Several other col-

¹ The term "college" came originally from Roman law, in which it signified a group of individuals having a common purpose and some kind of corporate standing. Such *collegia* were especially of religious, political and industrial character. This generic meaning of the term is found in the "College of Cardinals" and "Electoral College" of to-day. In the middle ages the name was applied to church schools, and thus its usage became primarily educational. For a detailed history of the term see the *Cyclopedia of Education*, art. "College."

leges were born before the Revolutionary War—King's College (now Columbia), the College of Pennsylvania, Rhode Island College (Brown), the College of New Hampshire (Dartmouth), and Queen's College (Rutgers). Thus there were in all nine pre-revolutionary colleges.

The colonies, we should bear in mind, were for a long time hardly more than spots of cultivation in a wilderness which was held by Indians. The population was small, travel was exceedingly difficult, industries were undeveloped, poverty was often harsh, and there were scarcely any common schools. Life was dominated by religious zeal and characterized by moral severity, conditions which of course reflected themselves in the colleges.

The original purpose of the college foundations was first and foremost the training of ministers. Many of the early colonists were educated men, graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, men full of idealism for their home in the new world and inclined to set supreme value upon a properly educated ministry. For a century or more an astonishingly large percentage of college graduates—running in some periods as high as seventy or eighty—became clergymen and missionaries. More broadly, the purpose of the early college was the education of a moral and religious citizenship. "Let every student," so runs one of the first Rules and Precepts of Harvard, "be plainly instructed, and earnestly pressed to consider well, the maine end of his life and studies is, TO KNOW GOD AND JESUS CHRIST WHICH IS ETERNAL LIFE, Joh. xvii. 3, and therefore to lay Christ in the bottome, as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning."² Similarly the first advertisement of King's College says that "The chief Thing that is aimed at in this College is, to teach and engage the Children to *know God in Jesus Christ*, and to love and serve him, in all *Sobriety, Godliness, and Righteousness* of Life, with a *perfect Heart, and a willing Mind*; and to train them up in all virtuous Habits, and all such-useful Knowledge as may render them creditable to their Families and Friends, Ornaments to their

² For a complete statement of these Rules and Precepts see Birdseye, *Individual Training in our Colleges*, pp. 19, 20.

Country and useful to the public Weal in their Generations.”³

In fulfilment of this purpose the colleges were conducted as “theological boarding schools.” Their presidents and many of their teachers were clergymen, their curriculum was saturated with theological ideas and theological argument, their daily life was punctuated with religious exercises. The later foundations, particularly the College of Pennsylvania, laid more emphasis upon scientific, political and industrial study. In other words the purpose of the college broadened as the life of the colonies became more complex, and educational needs other than those of religion came more clearly into the foreground. In a general way, however, the religious purpose of higher education remained in force.

The little seats of learning labored in serious poverty. Their income was pitifully meager and uncertain, books were scarce, and equipment scanty. There were no laboratories. The “valuable philosophical apparatus” of Yale, consisted of surveying instruments, a telescope, a microscope, and a barometer; these constituted its original facilities for the pursuit of natural science.⁴ Money was collected from faithful friends in this country and in England for the advancement of religious education in the new world; and lotteries, authorised by the colonial governments, were an occasional source of revenue until moral sentiment put an end to the practice. Tuition fees were of course small; indeed the entire expense of a college education was less than that of a single year in the college of to-day. Money was so scarce that gifts and fees came in the form of silverware and country produce. Every fact of the financial history of the early colleges spells sacrifice.⁵

³ Thwing, *History of Higher Education in America*, p. 116.

⁴ Thwing, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

⁵ “Even the presidents had to take ‘country pay.’ Parents settled for tuition in produce and cattle, such as ‘a barrel of pork,’ ‘a old cow,’ ‘turkey henes,’ ‘two wether goatts,’ ‘a bush. of parsnapes,’ ‘a ferkinge of butter,’ ‘a red ox,’ ‘appelles,’ ‘a ferkinge of soap,’ ‘rose watter,’ ‘three pecks of peasse,’ ‘beaffe,’ ‘fouer shotes from the farm,’ ‘tobacko,’ etc. Such gifts made in country

Social Conditions

The social arrangements of these colleges were distinctly of the boarding school type. The faculty and students—forty or fifty boys and a few teachers living constantly in close association—might almost be regarded as a large family. The youngsters, entering commonly between the ages of twelve and fifteen, needed a parental supervision from their elders, and certainly obtained it. Discipline was of the strictest sort. Each class was under the authority of a particular tutor who not only taught the boys whatever they studied, but resided in the dormitory with them and ate at the same table. Clothing, spending money, hours of study and play, all were subjects of minute regulation, with corresponding penalties for breaking rules. An elaborate system of freshman service imposed obligation to run errands and do other small offices for members of upper classes as well as for the faculty. Of course this practice lent itself to petty tyranny and persecution, of which "hazing" is a direct descendant. Altogether the lot of the freshman must have been less happy than it is to-day. Upperclassmen were also under strict regulation with regard to conduct, though of course less so than freshmen. It hardly need be added, however, that the strictness of the regime did not prevent disorder. Boarding school rules have always been regarded as existing partly in order to be broken, and frontier manners are boisterous. Some of the outbreaks, as that of 1807 at Harvard and the "Bread and Butter Rebellion" of 1828 at Yale, are historic.⁶

Among the "Ancient Customs of Harvard College" were the following:

"No Freshman shall wear his hat in the College yard, unless it rains, hails or snows, provided he be on foot, and have not both hands full.

produce or in animals were available at the commons, or were turned over to the members of the faculty as part pay. This was to be expected when barter was the usual form of exchange. Sometimes, however, there were complaints that a little more cash and a little less of produce would be acceptable." Birdseye, *Individual Training in Our Colleges*, p. 52.

⁶ Sheldon, *Student Life and Customs*, pp. 106 ff.

"No Undergraduate shall wear his hat in the College yard when any of the Governors of the College are there; and no Bachelor shall wear his hat when the President is there.

"All the Undergraduates shall treat those in the Government of the College with respect and deference; particularly they shall not be seated without leave in their presence; they shall be uncovered when they speak to them or are spoken to by them.

"All Freshmen (except those employed by the Immediate Government of the College) shall be obliged to go on any errand (except such as shall be judged improper by some one in the Government of the College) for any of his Seniors, Graduates or Undergraduates, at any time, except in studying hours, or after nine o'clock in the evening.

"When any person knocks at a Freshman's door, except in studying time, he shall immediately open the door without inquiring who is there.

"No scholar shall call up or down, to or from, any chamber in the College.

"No scholar shall play football or any other game in the College yard, or throw anything across the yard.

"The Freshmen shall furnish the batts, balls and footballs for the use of the students, to be kept at the Buttery."

The statement concludes with a provision that "The Sophomores shall publish these Customs to the Freshmen in the Chapel, whenever ordered by any in the Government of the College; at which time the Freshmen are enjoined to keep their places in their seats, and attend with decency to the reading."⁷

An especially interesting chapter might be written concerning the commons, with its minute rules of conduct, vicissitudes of fare, its "dinner messes" and "supper messes," its "sizings of bread," "pyes," "cues of beer," and the tendency of youth at meals to introduce gleeful irregularities of behavior. How healthy appetites must have rebelled at the rule prohibiting extra food and drink because "young scholars, to the dishonor of God, hindrance

⁷ Thwing, *op. cit.*, pp. 42, 43.

of their studies and damage of their friends' estate, inconsiderately and intemperately are ready to abuse their liberty of sizing besides their commons"! College boarding halls have frequently been the scene of disturbances verging on riot and revolution, and the record is occasionally tinged with the humor of such performances. No feature of college life, however, has been more significant than the common meal; its unifying power is almost sacramental.

Play was not a prominent feature of college life. "Athletics" in the modern meaning of the term did not exist, and physical sports were more or less irregular and unsystematic. Indeed the time for such diversion was brief, since study hours were rigidly fixed and the youngsters had liberty only after meals. Many innocent games were strictly forbidden on account of their evil associations. Backgammon and tenpins, as well as cards and dice, were long under the ban. The physical condition of students sometimes suffered from excessive study and insufficient exercise, while now and then poor food contributed to the undermining of health. Vacations had not reached their present well defined status. They were at first allowances of time to go home for clothing. Later there were periods of a few weeks in summer, winter and spring. A winter vacation for the purpose of allowing students to earn money by teaching in rural schools was a fixed feature of the college year for more than half the last century. In general the importance of play and recreation failed to receive due recognition, though the play instincts of youth naturally demanded expression, and there is abundant evidence that fun-loving human nature found outlets for its energy.

Strict disciplinary ideas prevailed. The punishable offences were a strange combination of religious impiety, moral wrong doing, and mere infraction of social custom. Profanity, lying, and carrying a cane into chapel were all regarded as more or less sinful. Punishment took the form of flogging, fines, and extra lessons. The president and fellows of Harvard were authorized by the General Court in 1656 "to punish all misdemeanors of the youth in their society, either by fine or whipping in the Hall openly,

as the nature of the offense shall require, not exceeding ten shillings or ten stripes for one offense.”⁸ An interesting bit of history which has descended to us is the account of the whipping of a boy for profanity. It took place in the library under the supervision of the president, and was preceded and followed by prayer. At Columbia it was ordained that those who absented themselves from religious worship be fined two pence for every offence, and one penny for tardiness. Further, “None of the Pupils shall fight Cocks, play at Cards, Dice or any unlawful game under penalty of being fined not exceeding Five shillings for the first offence, and being openly admonished and confessing their fault for the second, and expulsion if contumacious.”⁹ Punishment also took the form of lowering the social rank of the offender in the posted list of scholars, for differences of birth and parentage gave rise to aristocratic precedence in the college. The spirit of democratic equality at length put an end to this practice. Many features of the social order remained until comparatively recent times, but gradually the increasing age of students and the development of a more liberal educational policy lessened the disciplinary stringency.

The simplicity and rigor of this half academic, half domestic life stand in sharp contrast to the complexity and comfort of the modern college. It is amusing to think of the state of mind of a luxury-loving college undergraduate of to-day if he were obliged to pass a harsh New England winter in the cheerless accommodations of the Harvard or Yale or Dartmouth of two centuries ago. Probably the experience would be good for him.

The Curriculum

“When any schollar is able to read Tully, or such like classical Latin author *ex tempore*, and make and speake true Latin in verse and prose, *suo (ut aiunt) Marte*, and decline perfectly the paradigms of nounes and verbes in ye Greek tongue, then may hee bee admitted into ye col-

⁸ Birdseye, op. cit., pp. 7, 8.

⁹ *The American College*, March, 1910, p. 511.

ledge, nor shall any claim admission before such qualification." So runs the first of Harvard's original Rules and Precepts. For a long time, indeed, the entrance requirements were very simple—Latin, the rudiments of Greek, and arithmetic. Elementary education was undeveloped and the lack of preparatory schools threw most of the burden of fitting boys for college upon private tuition, frequently that of the local clergyman. As the public school system grew, more extensive and thorough preparation became possible. In general this preliminary study was patterned after the college curriculum, particularly its classical features. Latin, though perhaps not the ability to "make and speake it" with purity of diction, remained a *sine qua non* for admission until recent times.

Turning to the course of study as it existed two centuries ago, we find it narrow in comparison with that of the modern college. The first college curriculum in America, that established at Harvard by President Dunster, reads as follows:

(1) Mondays and Tuesdays: Philosophy, comprising logic and physics for the first year, ethics and politics for the second year, arithmetic, geometry and astronomy for the third year. For each morning, theory; for each afternoon, practice in philosophical disputations.

(2) Wednesdays: Greek for all classes. For the first year, etymology and syntax, with afternoon practice in the rules of grammar; for the second year, prosody and dialectics, with practice in poesy after dinner; for the third year, more Greek in theory and practice.

(3) Thursdays: Theory of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac grammar with practice in corresponding Biblical texts.

(4) Fridays: Rhetoric, with English composition and declamation.

(5) Saturdays: Mornings, "Divinity Catecheticall" and "Common Places," i.e., scholastic disputations; afternoons, history in the winter, nature of plants in the summer.¹⁰

This curriculum, it will be noted, covered only three years. It was subsequently expanded to four, the succes-

¹⁰ Foster, *Administration of the College Curriculum*, pp. 12, 13.

sive classes being designated as freshmen, sophomores, junior and senior sophisters.

Other colleges as they arose offered much the same studies. More than a century after the founding of Harvard we find King's College prescribing the classics, mathematics and philosophy, together with geography, physics, agriculture and merchandise, history, and principles of law and government. Rhetoric and practice in declamation and debate play a considerable part. Hebrew is studied by those who intend to become ministers.

This curriculum was somewhat narrower than it seems, for the history and science of the day were meager in the extreme, and the philosophy was devoted to theological interests. In breadth of information the course was deficient; but in point of disciplinary training the value of the subjects and method was large. The classical studies served to develop literary power, and the emphasis upon "disputations" could hardly fail to cultivate argumentative skill. This critical and intensive character helped to produce many distinguished thinkers and leaders in American affairs. It remained substantially unchanged for nearly two centuries.

Examinations were oral, and visitors might participate in conducting the ordeal. Graduation exercises consisted of dissertations and arguments, mostly upon ethical and theological subjects, and often couched in Latin. In fact Latin was the language of scholarship, of textbooks, of class exercises, and of declamation and debate—a fact which explains its central importance as an entrance requirement. A report of the first Commencement of Rhode Island College tells us that seven "young Gentlemen commenced Bachelors in the Arts" with a salutary oration in Latin, "pronounced with much Spirit." Following this came a dispute in English on the subject. "The Americans, in their present Circumstances, cannot, consistent with good policy, affect to become an independent State." There was also an oration on Benevolence, in which the speaker shrewdly emphasized the fact that his "infant Seminary stands in Need of the salutary Effects of that truly Christian Virtue." After a syllogistic dispute on the

thesis "*Materia cogitare non potest*"—the reporter cautiously remarks that "the principal Arguments on both Sides were produced, toward settling that important Point—degrees were conferred, and the Valedictorian "took a most affectionate Leave of his Classmates.—The Scene was tender—the Subject felt—and the Audience affected." Music was interspersed between the disputes and orations, and the whole performance occupied an entire day.¹¹

In no respect was the character of the early college more marked than that of religion. The primary purpose, as we have seen, was profoundly religious. College officers, trustees, president and faculty, were usually clergymen, sometimes of professional distinction, as Increase Mather at Harvard and Jonathan Edwards at Yale. Strict religious conformity was necessary. President Dunster of Harvard, for openly opposing infant baptism, was indicted, tried, convicted, and sentenced to a public admonition and to give bonds for good behavior.¹² In 1722 President Cutler and a tutor were dismissed from Yale because they had become Episcopalians.¹³ The curriculum was heavily charged with theology. In the early days of Harvard students met frequently in their tutors' rooms for Bible reading, catechetical examination, and prayer. On Sundays there were lengthy sermons, the repetition of which constituted a student exercise. A large number of graduates, youths not yet out of their teens, entered the ministry, and in many cases became famous as the spiritual leaders of colonial progress.

An interesting picture of the life of a college student in colonial times is found in the diary of a junior at Yale in 1762. Some of its entries are the following:

"26th. Studied my recitation in Tully de Oratore.

"27th. Saturday. Attended Coll. Exs. Heard Mr. Daggett preach two sermons on the trinity of ye Godhead, I John, v, 8. Read some in Milton's Samp. Agon.

"29. Attended Coll. Exs. Studied Homer almost ye whole day. Read a few pages in Tuscul. Disput. Had

¹¹ *Brown Alumni Monthly*.

¹² Birdseye, op. cit., p. 41.

¹³ Birdseye, op. cit., p. 35.

no recns to-day, our Tutor being out of town.

"30. Attended prayers. Studied Homer in forenoon. Writ argument on our forensick question, wh. was WHETHER ADAM KNEW YT ETERNAL DAMNATION WOULD BE HIS DOOM IF HE EAT THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT? Had no recitation. Afternoon worked out a question in Algebra and studied some in Septuagint.

"Friday, 9. Attended Coll. Exs. Studied Homer in forenoon. In the afternoon read in Martin's Philosophy and in Whiston's Ast (Astronomical) Principles of Religion. At night Nichols, Hallock, and Brewster were publicly admonished for having a Dance at Milford, and for their general conduct. Bull, for going to Milford without liberty and for his general conduct, was ordered to depart from College and to live under the care of some minister at a distance till he should show signs of reformation. Hinman, Kellogg, Kingsbury, and Botsford were fined 2s. 6d. for being at the dance at Milford.

"21. N.B.—Got through 16th Book of Homer, where I shall stop for ye present. Afternoon. In Pope's Homer. Spent remainder of ye afternoon in drinking tea and conversation.

"Evening felt melancholy and dejected on thinking of ye difficulties my DADDE must undergo to provide for me here at college."¹⁴

The early American college must not be regarded merely as a historical curiosity. It deserves our profound respect. In spite of its poverty, its scanty equipment, its religious bigotry and the narrowness of its curriculum, it did an important educational work, and it sent out graduates who took a prominent part in spiritual and secular affairs. Not only clergymen, but lawyers, judges, governors, legislators and presidents, in fact the leaders of political and professional life, received their education in these humble institutions. The college possessed moral ideals and gave moral training. Though essentially related to the peculiar civilization that surrounded it, and not suitable to the broader culture of to-day, it nevertheless exhibited

¹⁴ Thwing, op. cit., pp. 101, 102.

superior efficiency and value. In education the personal contact of teacher and pupil is of the first importance. This condition was characteristic of the early college. In the development of higher education it has been largely lost or overlaid by other interests. How to restore it is a profound problem.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Expansion

The wonderful development of higher education in our national life is so vast a subject that we can only note a few of its most important features. First, in point of numerical expansion the college kept pace with the rapid growth of the nation. While the older colleges increased in size and in wealth many new ones appeared both in the more populous east and in the sparsely settled west. Wherever civilization extended its frontier there arose sooner or later among the settlers a demand for intellectual culture, and in response came numerous college and university foundations. To mention only a few of these milestones of educational progress, Bowdoin was founded in Maine in 1794, Union in New York in 1795, Alleghany in Pennsylvania in 1815, Oberlin in Ohio in 1833, Knox in Illinois in 1837, Grinnell in Iowa in 1847, Colorado College in 1874, Whitman in Washington in 1883, Pomona in California in 1887. In the south likewise, from Maryland to Texas, the educational idealism of the people expressed itself in college foundations. Most of the new institutions were sectarian—illustrations of the historic bond between religion and education. A few, like Williams, were undenominational. In addition came the establishment and remarkable development of state universities; every commonwealth with the exception of a few in the east instituted its own higher education. The middle period of the nineteenth century was especially prolific; the country was overspread with hundreds of schools of advanced learning, each one an embodiment of rising civilization.

Not only did the older type of college thus multiply its

numbers, but special schools were established for the study of law, medicine, theology, engineering, and various other professional and technological subjects.¹ Some of these schools were independent; others were conjoined with colleges of the earlier kind. Thus we observe the development of three types of higher educational institution: the college of liberal arts, having a varied curriculum composed mostly of cultural studies; the professional or technological school (or college), offering a definitely vocational course of instruction; and the university, comprising several such schools and a college of the first sort.²

¹This development began before the opening of the nineteenth century. The Medical College of Philadelphia was founded in 1765, the first law school appeared in Connecticut in 1784, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute began its work in 1825. See Dexter, *History of Education in the United States*, Chs. XVI, XVII. More recent are the schools of education, journalism, commerce, forestry, which have elevated training for these occupations to the level of higher education.

²For the history of the term "college" see Ch. II, Note, p. 11. The name is now properly applied to several kinds of advanced school, e.g., College of Physicians and Surgeons, College of Engineering, Agricultural College, etc. The College of "liberal Arts"—the historic name for philosophy, science, language and literature—is in some cases designated as College of Arts and Sciences, or College of Literature and Science.

Historically the European "university" comprised four "faculties," namely those of liberal arts, law, medicine and theology. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge have had a distinctive character as groups of residential colleges. The American university has derived its form from both sources.

The titles of college and university are much abused, however. Many institutions which are little more than ill equipped secondary schools have assumed them with no more justification than the hopes of founders and the complacency of a legislature. A definition adopted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for its own purposes of standardization is as follows: "An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work, a course of four full years in liberal arts and sciences, and shall require for admission not less than the usual four years of academic or high school preparation, in addition to the pre-academic or grammar school studies." The National Association of State Universities specifies for membership: that the college of arts and sciences shall require for entrance a high school course of four years or its equivalent, and shall give two years of general or liberal study, followed by two years of

Statistical facts in the field of higher education vary from year to year, increasing for the most part with such rapidity that any set of figures soon becomes out of date. Perhaps it is worth our while, however, to note that in 1916, according to the report of the United States Commissioner of Education, there were 563 institutions of higher education—universities, colleges, and independent professional and technological schools, ninety-three being state institutions—or one for each hundred and seventy-five thousand of population. Paradoxically, the ratio is least where the population is densest, in the northern and central states. The total number is decreasing, since consolidations, and the abandonment of these which are hopelessly poverty stricken more than overbalance new foundations.

The total attendance is far from decreasing, however. National growth swelled the number of students, gradually at first, then with accelerated rapidity, until in recent years the rate of increase has become four times that of the population. Fifty years ago the largest universities had five or six hundred students. At the present time several have an enrollment of more than five thousand, and bid fair to become huge educational communities of double this number. The college has gained a normal attendance of hundreds, the university of thousands.³

In the country at large more than two hundred thousand young men and women are enjoying the advantages of higher education, approximately half the number being in colleges of liberal arts, and the others distributed among the various specialized schools of technical and professional training. It is a magnificent army of progress, yet we must not overlook the fact that relatively only a few boys and girls ever attain these advantages. The number of children enrolled in the primary grades is about twenty

advanced study of more specialized character; that at least five departments must have adequate facilities for three years of graduate work leading to the degree of doctor of philosophy; and that there must be at least one professional or technical school requiring for entrance two years of college work.

³ The total registration at Columbia University in 1916, excluding that of its enormous summer school, was almost twelve thousand.

millions, but this number shrinks to about a million and a half in the secondary schools, and this again to less than a quarter of a million in the more advanced institutions. The youth of the latter is almost literally one in a hundred; the rest have dropped out by the way, unwilling or unable to pursue further study.

The financial side of the development of higher education has been equally impressive. "At the beginning of the nineteenth century," says President Thwing, "the whole amount of the productive funds of all the colleges was probably less than five hundred thousand dollars."⁴ It is now approximately four hundred millions; and an even larger sum is represented by material equipment, such as buildings, libraries and apparatus. A few universities have endowment amounting to twenty million dollars or more; several have an income of one to three millions. Most state universities, on the other hand, have comparatively little productive endowment, and charge small tuition fees or none at all. Their income derived from taxation, however, equals and promises to exceed that of their richly endowed sisters. A millage tax upon the property of an affluent state yields its university a revenue which privately founded institutions, even though wealthy, may well envy. The total income for the country is over a hundred million dollars, half of which comes from tuition fees, and half from gifts, bequests, interest on endowment, and taxation.

Huge as are these financial figures it is nevertheless true that colleges and universities almost without exception find their resources inadequate. So vast and expensive is their work, so needed the increase of instruction and equipment, that the problem of making both ends meet is one which constantly faces college and university administrations. And it is a problem which seems to have no prospect of solution!

The Development of the Curriculum

The curriculum responded to the national development rather slowly. Ancient languages, rhetoric, mathematics, philosophy, with a little history and science, constituted

⁴ *History of Higher Education in America*, p. 324.

the bulk of college study throughout the first half of the nineteenth century as they had done for the two centuries preceding. The principal changes were that Hebrew was dropped or made elective, the sciences of chemistry, physics, astronomy, geology, botany and zoology gained a foothold, instruction in history and economics was improved, and modern languages attained a somewhat uncertain standing.⁵ There was criticism on the ground that the college had failed to keep pace with the times, and with the new interests of expanding national life. Instruction in modern languages was demanded, not only for literary and historical purposes, but in order to facilitate commercial relations with other countries. Great advances were being made in the field of pure science, advances which it was presumably the business of the college to promulgate. Inside and outside pressure gradually forced a reform of the curriculum. The new subjects received recognition, and the old ones reluctantly gave way. Yet the inertia of conservatism was so great that the new ideas gained ground very slowly, and we find the old order abiding in many colleges until late in the century.⁶

The decade 1820-1830 witnessed an especially noteworthy outburst of the new educational idealism. Thomas Jefferson's plan for the University of Virginia, founded through his influence in 1825, shows the most advanced spirit of the time, and may well remain a beacon for guidance to-day. According to it the purposes of higher education are:

(1) To form the statesmen, legislators, and judges,

⁵ Within the opening years of the century at least five colleges introduced instruction in chemistry and natural philosophy (physics). William and Mary College established a chair of history in 1822. Economics was taught at Harvard in 1820. In the same period several colleges provided instruction in French, usually as an "extra" study. Thwing, *History of Higher Education in America*, pp. 301 ff.

⁶ "Throughout the century the history of the college curriculum is the record of institutions, under conservative influences, forced by the growth of human knowledge and the demands of an increasingly complex civilization, to take up one new subject after another, and present them in more vital relations to present social, industrial and political needs." Foster, *Administration of the College Curriculum*, p. 21.

upon whom public prosperity and individual happiness are so much to depend;

(2) To expound the principles and structure of government, the laws which regulate the intercourse of nations, those formed municipally for our own government, and a sound spirit of legislation, which, banishing all unnecessary restraint on individual action, shall leave us free to do whatever does not violate the equal rights of another;

(3) To harmonize and promote the interests of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, and by well informed views of political economy to give a free scope to the public industry;

(4) To develop the reasoning faculties of our youth, enlarge their minds, cultivate their morals, and instil into them the precepts of virtue and order;

(5) To enlighten them with mathematical and physical sciences, which advance the arts, and administer to the health, the subsistence, and comforts of human life;

(6) And, generally, to form them to habits of reflection and correct action, rendering them examples of virtue to others, and of happiness within themselves.⁷

A central feature of this project was its application of the "elective" principle. The curriculum of the university was divided into ten departments or "schools," and it was enacted that "Every student shall be free to attend the schools of his choice, and no other than he chooses." In other colleges the same principle of freedom was very guardedly admitted in the form of "options"—between Hebrew and French, for example—or "extra studies" for which a special fee was charged. At Harvard, under the influence of George Ticknor, and at Brown under that of President Francis Wayland, there was a considerable extension of the new idea. In general, however, the regime of required studies continued throughout American colleges until the last third of the century. Then at length the spirit of freedom, the increased range of study, and the strong influence of Harvard under the presidency of Eliot made the elective system dominant in American higher education. Little by little the prescribed mathematics,

⁷ Thwing, *History of Higher Education in America*, p. 199.

classics and other subjects were pushed back into the earlier years of the course, modified or eliminated, while their places were taken by new studies. The curriculum became an ever widening field over which the student might range almost at will.⁸

With regard to principles and methods of instruction the early colonial college was English in character; it began with a "tutorial" system. Later influences, particularly those of the movement toward educational freedom which culminated in the founding of the University of Virginia, were of French origin. Still later, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, it was the German university, with its advanced study and original research, which stimulated progress. Johns Hopkins University was founded at Baltimore in 1876 especially for the training of scholars, and its influence soon spread to other institutions. The development of the curriculum called for new methods of instruction. Scientific laboratories appeared, and libraries grew with unprecedented rapidity. Lectures supplanted classroom drill. College teaching became in form and substance the communication of the maturest and the most recent scholarship. Inevitably there was a loss of "individual training" and of the peculiar disciplinary value of the older regime, but on the whole the development produced educational maturity and signified progress.

Social Development

At its origin the American college, which was patterned after English models, had an inheritance of aristocratic ideas; its enrollment was largely from the upper classes of society, and its daily life was slightly tinged by social distinctions. The revolutionary spirit of freedom and equality naturally put an end to this, however, and as the nation developed we find the college becoming increasingly "democratic," in the sense that it reached out to include

⁸Leading institutions now list enough courses in a single department to occupy the entire time of a student, were he to take them all at the usual rate of fifteen hours a week, during his whole college course and longer. To complete all the courses offered by a modern university college of the first rank would take a lifetime.

all classes, and that any one with ambition could obtain its privileges. Especially did the state universities, with their free instruction, invite to their halls the youth of every sort and condition. Not only has the expanding public school system made a highway for individual progress, but not infrequently young men and women outside its scope have found an open road along which they could make their way, with determined industry, to the best education that our national life affords. Young men have got their vision in the depths of an Illinois coal mine, in the granite quarries of Maine, in the factories of the east and on the farms of the west, and have attained eminence in law, in medicine and surgery, and as political leaders of the nation. A large majority of college students are the children of parents who did not themselves have the privileges which they bestow with such eager self sacrifice upon their sons and daughters; and at least a third of the total number are wholly or partially supporting themselves in college. In view of these facts it is clear that higher education has become democratically representative of the nation.⁹

Expansion in numbers also produced complexity of organization. As the natural tendency of any large body is to subdivide into smaller groups, we find from decade to decade an increasing number of clubs and societies of various kinds, each of which helped in its own way to give character to college life. Literary and debating soci-

* All colleges declare themselves to be internally "democratic," and the assertion is generally true. Real ability and sterling qualities of character everywhere receive recognition. On the whole, men win their places in college by merit, and merit alone. Class and college officers, scholarly honors, positions on athletic teams, and the like, go to students who deserve them, regardless of minor considerations. Exceptions to this rule are so rare as to be negligible. In this sense democracy operates in college quite as successfully as in society at large. On the other hand there is a great deal of caste spirit, snobbishness, ostentatious wealth, and some social injustice. This is inevitable, and it lies beyond the range of regulation. If it does not take a conspicuously offensive form, or intrude itself into the government of the college, it does not refute the assertion that the latter is really democratic.

eties came down from colonial times; to these was added a lengthening list of fraternities, musical and dramatic clubs, college newspapers and magazines, and a dozen forms of athletic sports, not to mention numerous less conspicuous activities.¹⁰ These are now numbered by scores in a single college, while several universities have well over a hundred. Social functions fill the college calendar, making college citizenship quite as complex, quite as taxing and exciting as is citizenship in a larger political group. Whereas these matters were until recently distinctly secondary features of college life, they have in some cases reached a pitch of competition with the curriculum, or even of dominance over it. One writer estimates the amount of non-studious college life as ninety per cent! But whatever the percentage, it is certain that the college has evolved from a small boarding school into a large educational community with a multitude of diverse social interests and activities.¹¹

One consequence of this social evolution was the separation of faculty and student body. As the latter increased in numbers and in complexity of organization, the former

¹⁰ For an extensive account of this development see Sheldon, *Student Life and Customs*, Chs. III, IV, V.

¹¹ What should be the attitude of college authorities toward this remarkable social development is a puzzling problem. It is humorously proposed to recognize it as inevitable and to establish colleges without any curriculum of study whatever, but with appropriate degrees for social and athletic accomplishment—S.S. (Social Shark), Sp.D. (Doctor Spheromachiae), and the like. More seriously we are told that study is only one kind of education, and that training for citizenship comes in other ways. Certainly these social activities are not mere diversions; they are varied ways of socializing the individual in preparation for later life. Some of them, especially athletics and the college press, have the function of unifying the college body. Others are rather divisive, e.g., fraternities, but may be made cooperative in advancing the welfare of the college. It should be added that the extent of this social hypertrophy is commonly overestimated. Study, because it is naturally quiet and secluded, escapes observation, its currents run deep, while the superficial, effervescent froth of the stream of college life is more conspicuous. There is more hard work in college than the public is sometimes led to suppose, and the amount is increasing. Social activities are being subjected to order, related to study, and made instrumental to the good of the institution.

likewise found itself occupied with new interests, especially those of private study, so that the college community tended to divide itself into two parts which met in the class room and on certain formal occasions, but otherwise revolved around different social centers. This condition has been somewhat overcome by deliberate "mixing," but in general students find few points of social contact with their instructors. Of course the parental supervision characterizing the early college is gone, irrevocably and properly, but it is to be hoped that a friendly spirit will develop in its place. What is needed is a greater measure of social intercourse based on common educational sympathies. Some students carry away from college, among their most highly prized recollections, that of comradeship with their teachers, a relation which gave all topics, political, recreational and religious as well as those of study, a common interest. It is desirable that more should do so.

The social development also necessitated a change in ideas of college government. The domestic regime of the early college with its strict regulations and petty discipline proved inadequate to the new conditions, the more so because the maturity of students increased with the spread of facilities for preparatory education, so that the problem was that of governing young men rather than boys. The college atmosphere was pervaded, too, by a spirit of freedom, a legacy from revolutionary times. Lawlessness and insubordination were so frequent that "college pranks" became a byword. We read of student rebellions, of town and gown rows, of predatory societies which raided hen-roosts and wantonly destroyed property, of the ceremonial burning of textbooks, of discordant serenades to unpopular members of the faculty, and so on. The more stringent the college discipline, the greater was the temptation to perpetrate some humorous defiance of authority.¹²

Here and there, however, the leaven of orderly self government was at work. The idea of a college democracy was in the mind of Thomas Jefferson, and it formed a part of his project of the University of Virginia, which influ-

¹² See Sheldon, *Student Life and Customs*, Chap. III.

enced many other institutions. Among the more notable experiments were those of the University of Illinois in 1868, a very elaborate organization which soon proved unworkable, and the more effective Amherst "senate" of 1883. The most practical feature of these schemes was the "honor system" of conducting examinations. Apart from this the various efforts were not very successful. But though the governmental organizations usually had a troubled and transitory existence, the outcome was a deepened sense of student responsibility, a diminution of lawlessness, and at least an approach to democratic self control. Thus the soul of the nation, vigorous, bumptious, self reliant and progressive, revealed itself in the life of the college.

Finally, the social development of the college has displayed idealism in respect to religion. The early conditions, it will be recalled, were those of strict orthodoxy and formal piety, conditions which could not remain unaffected by the secular tendencies of national life. In time, under the influence of the revolutionary spirit, the college atmosphere was shot through with free thinking. Atheism and agnosticism were occasionally in fashion. Conformity to religious requirements tended to become perfunctory or even disorderly, and indifference to religious interests sometimes took the form of vicious practices. On the other hand the formation of religious societies, particularly the Christian Associations which entered the colleges in the latter part of the century, encouraged religious interest and gave it practical direction. Teaching no less than practice presented religion in a more favorable light. Its vital function in human life is recognized, because it is seen to mean, not verbal profession or formal worship, but faith in one's fellows, right purposes, and friendly helpfulness. Even the doubtful who, like Abou Ben Adhem, are uncertain about their relation to God, desire to be written among those who love their fellow men. Though there is yet large room for religious development in college life the general tendency is upward.

CHAPTER IV

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENTS

The Small College

Of the hundreds of American institutions of higher education most are small colleges. Of the thousands of college students more than half are in little schools of learning scattered here and there throughout the country, many of them hardly known outside the circle of their immediate environment. Though the huge university is more conspicuous, and perhaps increasingly dominant in the movement of higher education, the spread and force of that movement reach far beyond the universities. The prevalent form of American higher learning is found in the halls of the small college.

The historical development of such colleges has been in general outline uniform. Established in faith and poverty they have worked loyally in memory of their founders, facing needs greatly in excess of their resources, and aiming constantly at ideals higher than mere material prosperity. Some have grown to the proportions of universities; a few have yielded to adverse circumstances and have been abandoned; most have persistently struggled along from year to year, preserving their original character and in some cases fortunately attaining independence. More than one is peculiarly a monument to a great president, a leader of large faith and broad vision who wrought wisely, untiringly, and with splendid self sacrifice, establishing the college firmly, and sending forth into the community, the state and the nation a stream of young men and young women characterized in some measure by his own steadiness

of purpose and energetic faith.¹ To belong as alumnus to such an institution is a lifelong distinction.

The small college ordinarily labors under great difficulties, however. Students usually prefer to enter larger and better equipped institutions, and those who come with a more modest ambition are sometimes drawn away to universities before the completion of their course. And in addition to such loss the prolongation of the high school course and the overshadowing importance of the professional and technical school seem in some cases to threaten the very existence of the small college. It is "squeezed" from all sides! The proposal has been made that it abandon its four year course and limit its work to the first two years of preparation for university study, a function for which it is especially fitted.² But as this change would virtually mean a termination of its historic individuality it can hardly find favor. Most colleges prefer to fight on.

The financial problem is especially serious. Almost every college feels the pinches of poverty, since the demand for instruction and the need of new material facilities increases more rapidly than its income. Its scanty endowment proves wholly inadequate, and support by the religious denomination which it represents is a fluctuating and uncertain resource. Fees must be low, particularly in competition with state universities which charge none, and this enhances the difficulty since higher education always costs more than the individual pays in fees. The expense per student is not infrequently two or three times the amount charged for tuition,³ and the deficit is increased in the case of students who enjoy free scholarships.

¹ Such, for example, were Eliphalet Nott of Union, Mark Hopkins of Williams, Francis Wayland of Brown, Nathan Lord of Dartmouth and Leonard Woods of Bowdoin. President Thwing remarks that "the history of each of these colleges is embodied in the biography of its president." *History of Higher Education in America*, p. 280.

² Harper, *Trend in Higher Education*, pp. 378 ff.

³ Evidently this unbusinesslike practice can be justified only by one consideration—the additional value of the educated citizen to society. Colleges are semi-philanthropic institutions, and on this ground are usually relieved wholly or in part of the burden of taxation. But this implies that they shall send out a properly

Forces seem to conspire to keep the college poor! Yet this academic poverty is often of a healthy, hopeful kind. The college looks forward to brighter days, and in the meantime works industriously with the means at its command.

There can be no doubt of the value of the services of the small colleges to the nation. Their necessary limitation to fundamentals in the curriculum, the close personal attention which their size permits them to give to the individual student, their intimate group life—these and other characteristics are distinctly meritorious. Situated in scores of communities which would otherwise have been without higher educational advantages, they have done much to sharpen the intelligence, elevate the taste, and strengthen the moral life of the American people.

The State University

In the state university we have a special development of American higher education which is perhaps its most distinctive and significant feature. It is not novel in principle, for the colonial colleges were in a sense state projects; but in its aims, the scope of its work, and the form which it has assumed in response to public needs, it peculiarly expresses the American spirit and gives promise for the future. It is the culminating embodiment of what has been termed the "state educational consciousness," i.e., the conviction that higher education is properly a function of the state, a sense of duty to support such education financially, and a conception of the service which the institution may render the state in return for this support. Many important problems of social, political and industrial life are under continual investigation at the state universities. These great and growing schools are destined to play a vital part in the development, not only of their respective states, but of the nation.⁴

educated and socialized product—and that this responsibility rests likewise upon the student. Free scholarships are justified in the same way. The recipients are not objects of charity, but are concrete human investments from whom a future return in good citizenship is rightly expected.

⁴A few cities have likewise capped their public school systems

The first movement of the sort appeared in the South. Maryland, Georgia, North Carolina and Tennessee established colleges before the close of the eighteenth century, and other states soon followed their example.⁵ The University of Virginia is especially noteworthy as the embodiment of the politico-educational ideas of Thomas Jefferson. A somewhat distinct movement began with the founding of universities by several states of the west, for from these have come the great institutions of the present day. The University of Michigan was founded in 1837. One commonwealth after another declared its conviction that social and political welfare are dependent upon an educated citizenship, until the network of universities stretched unbroken, except in a few of the Atlantic coast states, from Maine to California, from Florida to Washington.

At the outset the state institutions naturally assumed the traditional form of the earlier colleges, continuing the familiar curriculum and social life. In the closing decades of the nineteenth century, however, they developed the peculiar character which makes them of special interest to the student of the history of higher education. The dominating idea becomes that of organic relation to the state. Accordingly we find them putting themselves in closer touch with the secondary schools, broadening and simplifying entrance requirements, improving administration, eliminating corrupt political influences, and devising more generous support, frequently in the form of regular taxation. The curriculum expands in an unprecedented way both culturally and practically, but with special attention to the economic needs of the state and the development of intelligent citizenship.⁶

with a college or university. New York, Cincinnati, Louisville and a few others now have such municipal institutions. There have also been repeated projects for a national university, but as yet this idea remains unrealized, though the interest of the national government in higher education is expressed in a variety of ways, such as the Carnegie Bureau of Research and the Smithsonian Institution.

⁵ A leading motive was the desire to avoid the necessity of sending young men to the distant institutions of the north, with their different political and social atmosphere.

⁶ The University of Illinois, for example, includes the follow-

As a result of this development their attendance increases by leaps and bounds. Several have now passed the five thousand mark, and a few find themselves facing an approaching flood of double this number. Every year many thousands of American youth pass naturally and easily from their secondary schools to the best university education which their respective states afford. Higher learning broadens from an aristocratic privilege to a democratic opportunity.

No less significant are the varied forms of service which the university performs for its constituency throughout the state. To take the University of Wisconsin, the leader in this service, as an arch illustration, its library sends books all over the 56,000 square miles of its "larger campus," its school of agriculture develops improved methods of dairying and instructs farmers in the use of them, members of its faculty serve on all sorts of state boards, commissions and surveys, its students cooperate in gathering and distributing information on political and social topics. In short it is animated by an idealism of effective service which wins the respect and pride of the state as well as a liberal income.⁷

Social and moral conditions within the state universities are sometimes contrasted unfavorably, especially by religious critics, with those of other colleges. Such criticism, however, is usually the expression of ignorance and preju-

ing departments: College of Literature and Arts, College of Science, College of Engineering, College of Agriculture, Graduate School, Library School, School of Music, School of Education, School of Railway Engineering and Administration, College of Law, School of Pharmacy. Elsewhere we find schools of mining, of forestry, of medicine, of veterinary science, of journalism, and of architecture, under state auspices. Perhaps, as is alleged, the dominating spirit of state university education is practical, but it is noteworthy that the older curriculum of liberal study is retained and that several institutions are developing graduate schools with a tendency toward scholarly research. The University of California includes the Lick Observatory, and publishes volumes on archeology, ethnology, classical philology and philosophy.

⁷ For a detailed statement see Slosson, *Great American Universities*, Chap. VII.

dice. Whatever differences exist are superficial rather than profound. Human nature is essentially the same in college students and college faculties of all types. Yet it is true that the state university enjoys a heightened "consciousness of freedom" in respect to daily life, a feeling which arises partly from the absence of religious control, but also from its sheer size, which necessarily increases the distance between the central authority and the individual student. As a result there is perhaps a more prevalent inclination toward bumptious and boisterous fun-making than is found in privately controlled institutions. Its performances are more massive and unrestrained, hence more conspicuous. Possibly, too, the social frivolities incidental to coeducation are somewhat more wearisome, for here again is a matter which the size and constitution of the university renders difficult of regulation. But in spite of such abuse of freedom the life of the state university is on the whole sound and healthy. If the forces of folly are stronger than in the small college they are not so in comparison with other great universities, and in any case the forces of right living are at least equally strong.

Religious tendencies are likewise progressive. State universities are of course constitutionally free from sectarian domination, and at the same time are careful not to give offence to sectarian feeling. Attendance at religious services is voluntary, and the teaching of religious subjects must be broad if not strictly scientific and historical. On the other hand the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, not to mention numerous other organizations, take care of the religious interests of the individual student, and also perform various unofficial but effective services to the college community. Denominational authorities also are finding it desirable to maintain "college pastors" for the hundreds of students of their respective faiths in residence at the state university—numbers sometimes greater than those within their own colleges. Thus the atmosphere of religious freedom is favorable to harmony and progress; and the general condition which results is an advancement of religion in the broadest and best meaning of the term.

Higher Education for Women

This is less than a century old. In colonial times girls were trained in their homes for domestic duties—spinning, weaving and the other household arts—and were thought incapable of receiving intellectual education, though occasionally they shared private instruction with their brothers, and there were notable cases of highly cultured women in Revolutionary days. But with few exceptions there were no schools for girls,⁸ and little “schooling” beyond the most elementary kind. Illiteracy among women was common.

The need of education for women appeared in consequence of the industrial development of the country, and the increasing complexity of social life. The changing conditions tended to relieve them of their traditional domestic occupations and to place them in positions for which other qualifications were requisite. There was danger, of course, as we sometimes see to-day, that the kind of education fashionable for them would become that of shallow intellectual and artistic accomplishments, decorative rather than substantial. But fortunately a healthier development took place, partly through the special efforts of wise men and women who understood the problem, partly through the general extension to girls of the education which had previously been given only to boys.

In 1790 Boston admitted girls to its public schools, and ere long its example was followed by other cities and towns. Somewhat later several academies opened their doors to girls as well as to boys, while others were established exclusively for them. Particularly noteworthy are Emma Willard’s seminary at Troy, which began its work in 1822, and Mount Holyoke, founded by Mary Lyon in 1837. The spirit of these schools was studious and at the same time deeply religious. They are monuments of the earnest, thoughtful desire of their founders to give

⁸ The Moravians had a seminary for girls at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, as early as 1749. For a description of colonial conditions see Thwing, *History of Higher Education in America*, Ch. XV.

young women a form of education appropriate to their nature and situation in life.

The college education of women began at Oberlin. Four entered in 1837 as candidates for a degree, and three of these graduated four years later, the first women to receive a college degree in America. Oberlin thus set the example of collegiate coeducation for the country, an example which was soon followed by many other institutions. Of the colleges exclusively for women Elmira, established in 1855, was the pioneer. Ten years later Matthew Vassar founded the college which bears his name,⁹ and this was followed by other important foundations, Wellesley, Smith, Bryn Mawr, which independently gave women the opportunity of higher education. A third type appeared in the founding of Radcliffe College in 1879 as an annex to Harvard. Before the end of the century several other colleges and universities created similar departments for women, though usually with a limited curriculum and inadequate facilities. But here as elsewhere in college history small beginnings led to a more prosperous condition. The annex became the "coordinate college," growing quite as rapidly as its big brother, and, it must be acknowledged, displaying considerably more educational earnestness!

Each of these three types has its peculiarities, its advantages and disadvantages, both in curriculum facilities and in social life. Coeducation, however, is the predominant type throughout the country; in fact almost all colleges and universities admit young men and young women on the same footing.¹⁰

Young women have flocked to institutions of each kind. In coeducational colleges, especially those belonging to state universities, they usually outnumber the men, some-

⁹ "It is my hope to be the instrument, in the hands of Providence, of founding and perpetuating an institution which shall accomplish for young women what our colleges are accomplishing for young men." See Thwing, *op. cit.*, p. 344, 345.

¹⁰ Most of the colleges exclusively for either sex are in the Atlantic Coast states, and some of these belong to universities, e.g., Yale, which admit women to certain departments. Three state universities, Virginia, Georgia and Florida, have not as yet joined the coeducational ranks.

times in large preponderance, since the latter gravitate naturally toward technical and professional schools. Incidentally, very interesting problems have arisen concerning the kind of education most appropriate for women in respect to their tastes, natural habits of mind, and probable occupation in life. At the outset women necessarily accepted the existing curriculum, and sought zealously to demonstrate their competency in it—an effort which proved unquestionably successful. It is not clear, however, that this curriculum is altogether adapted to their needs. As general culture it is doubtless appropriate for both sexes, but as preparation for vocational life—and it has always included a great deal of this—it is conspicuously devoid of training for the kind of occupation into which most women go. This fact has led some institutions, especially state universities, to develop the scientific study of household economics to a high level of organization and efficiency. In advanced graduate and professional study comparatively few women are found, partly through lack of interest in research, but also, no doubt, because of unpromising economic conditions. As regards collegiate education, however, there is no question that it has proved acceptable, or that it has been abundantly justified by its results.

CHAPTER V

THE PURPOSE OF THE COLLEGE

The Meaning of Education

What is "education"? Since the college, like other schools, makes a business of it, let us begin by considering its general meaning. We find that definitions usually emphasize one or another of three ideas, all of which are essential. First, the traditional and familiar view is that education is a training of the mind,—a training especially of the intelligence, but also to some extent a training of the feelings and the will. It sharpens the powers of attention, of judgment and reasoning, it brings stores of information, it cultivates taste and sympathy, it forms habits and encourages activity and enterprise. Second, as the derivation of the term indicates, it "brings out" what is implicit in human nature. It develops instincts, interests and capabilities into mature power. Third, it "adjusts the individual to his environment" by giving him a better understanding of nature and a useful place in the world. Ideally, therefore, education is the process of developing the individual as an intelligent, active and sympathetic member of society.

This rather vague idea becomes clearer when we note that education deals with three fundamental characteristics of human nature, work, play and love—work in the sense of all serious, productive effort; play signifying broadly all forms of recreation, both physical and mental; love in its generic meaning of sympathetic social relationships—the scriptural and basic meaning of the term. These are indeed the essential features of life itself; without them the individual seems to us lacking in humanity. Workless lives there are, it is true—the tramp at one end of the

social scale and the idle rich at the other; but they arouse in us an instinctive revulsion. So too there are playless lives, and these, particularly in the case of children, are sometimes tragic. The discovery of the significance of play, and of the need of providing facilities for it, is one of the great educational accomplishments of recent times. Finally there are essentially unsympathetic lives, and they never fail to remind us that sympathy is essential to humanity. These interests are our human birthright; nature has provided us with instincts for exercising them. They are therefore also life's aims.

They are not separate and unrelated, however. Work may be done in the spirit of play—perhaps it should be so done much more frequently than is usual. Likewise many engaging plays—football and chess, for example—are rather hard work. And both work and play are ordinarily social performances; indeed their value lies partly in this fact. Love also expresses itself in both work and play. These aspects of life are thoroughly interdependent, and the ideal life is one which combines them in harmony. Education may therefore be regarded as the development and correlation of them in preparation for life.

We too commonly think of education as exclusively a matter of the intellect, and identify it with the process of acquiring information. We treat it as synonymous with knowledge or learning, as in the familiar saying that the educated man knows something about everything and everything about something. Accordingly our school curriculum makes its demands for the most part upon the intellect of the pupil, and sometimes seems hardly more than an effort to fill him up with facts and to give practice in routine mental operations. This view has a sound principle, namely that education is mental training, But it is one-sided in its emphasis upon recitation and its failure to recognize other forms of reaction. Education ought to involve the doing of things under the actual conditions of life. Moreover, the common view too often takes little or no account of the function of play and of the social nature of the individual. These should not be left to the casual training and associations of the

school playground and the street. In other words the mind should be trained, not simply for the sake of intellectual proficiency, but for the better exercise of all its industrial, recreational and sympathetic interests.¹

College Education

Like all education that of the college is the development of natural interests and powers. Its distinctive character is that by using the maturer faculties of the mind it accomplishes this in a more advanced and thorough way than do the lower schools. As training for work it disciplines the student in habits of intensive study; it teaches him to formulate a problem, gather materials for its solution, and think his way through to a conclusion. It thus cultivates the power of intelligent self direction and independent activity. In contrast to the technical and professional schools it offers less specific preparation for particular vocations, but its training, though more general, is none the less valuable with reference to later work. Analytic skill, systematic thoroughness, and the power of independent effort make for efficiency and success in every sphere of human activity.²

¹"I take it that the whole object of education is, in the first place, to train the faculties of the young in such a manner as to give their possessors the best chance of being happy and useful in their generation; and, in the second place, to furnish them with the most important portions of that immense capitalized experience of the human race which we call knowledge of various kinds." Huxley, *Science, Art, and Education*.

²There is plenty of evidence, statistics as well as personal testimony, that college students who give themselves this sort of training distinguish themselves in later life. The common opinion that the hard student is less successful than the unstudious "all round college man" is a lingering superstition unsupported by facts. Habits of luxury, laziness and superficial reading, even when accompanied by good nature and energy in "college life," do not constitute satisfactory preparation for industrial or professional pursuits. Fortunately it is possible to overcome most bad habits after leaving college. Many young men have been saved by going to work at hard, monotonous drudgery in office or factory. But these, in their own judgment, would have fared better had they made themselves capable workmen in their college years.

Secondly, the college offers facilities for training in play. Most conspicuous are those for physical recreation, a gymnasium full of apparatus, and an athletic field with gridiron, diamond, track and courts. Every one ought to learn, if he has not done so before entering college, how to take exercise in enjoyable ways. But play is not only physical; it includes mental recreation, and it is the duty of the college to develop such interests. A cultivated taste for the best literature and an appreciative understanding of the principal forms of art, especially music, the drama, painting and architecture, should be among the permanent results of a college course, to the relative exclusion of the forms of art and literature characteristic of the cheap novel and magazine, the Sunday Supplement, vaudeville and ragtime. A catholic taste may also be refined.

In the third place, college education is social education. We ordinarily take our social nature and relationships so uncritically that we do not appreciate the need of special attention and training in such matters. Yet this need unquestionably exists. It is quite as absurd to leave the social instincts to casual development as it would be to do this with intellectual powers. Education is requisite in both cases. The college is the place where the most thoroughly "socialized" type should be developed, the place from which the student should go forth with the best equipment for citizenship and social helpfulness. The features of college life which are especially useful for this purpose are the friendships, athletic games, clubs and fraternities, in fact every enterprise which involves the cooperation of several persons. The common enthusiasm, the sinking of selfish interests, the labor for some cause which is bigger than oneself, are the best social training. Yet these need to be rationally controlled and directed to worthy ends. The pitiable isolation of the man who cannot "mix" is no worse than the gregariousness which cannot bear solitude, or the cheap good fellowship of the "sport," or the frothiness of "society."³ Accordingly it is the business of the

³ The sound idea of college education as "training for citizenship" is occasionally perverted into contempt for study in com-

college to teach students the nature of their own social instinct and their relation to larger social activities.⁴

The distinctive character of college education lies in its application of the mature powers of the mind. Its training is more learned, is broader and more thorough than that of the lower schools. This implies in the first place that college graduates shall be able, as President Hadley has said, to calculate the unseen consequences of proposed conduct, and thus determine whether an action will in the long run work out the general good. Hasty, short sighted impulses are to be regulated by deliberately observing ultimate results. Secondly, higher education should lead to a more intelligent correlation of the various interests of life. Work and play, study and social effort all have their rightful place, and the difficulty is sometimes that of deciding what place. College training ought to prevent onesidedness of any sort, for the "grind" and the "sport" miss the same fullness of life. As a matter of fact college graduates as a class probably lead the most intelligent, well rounded, symmetrical lives.

Cultural and Practical Education

We have here an interesting controversy over educational ideals. Let us first see how it arose.

The earliest colleges were founded with a double purpose, to produce an educated clergy and an intelligent, moral

parison with the social features of college life. Many undergraduates and a few of their teachers have a comfortable conviction that four years of good fellowship, with a modicum of intellectual labor in the form of "culture courses," constitute the best preparation for life. Ideal citizenship, like professional success, is not attainable except through hard work.

⁴The sympathetic spirit is especially admirable when it spreads beyond the little group of personal associates and reaches humanity outside the college walls. Nothing is more to the credit of the modern college than the increasing number of young men and women who devote some time to social service, for example, work with boys' clubs and girls' classes. The period of later youth is naturally the one when the sympathies expand; and it is correspondingly desirable that these should become habituated to active, helpful expression during college years. The gain to society is matched by the strengthening and purification of the worker's character.

citizenship; in other words their aim was at the same time vocational training and liberal culture. Moreover, this twofold purpose remained as the college curriculum expanded. The ministry, it is true, ceased to be the leading vocation, and fell into the background, while certain other occupations, particularly teaching, medicine, law and business, came to the fore; but at all times we find students pursuing their college course with definite occupational purpose, and where possible selecting their studies with reference to this. On the other hand the conception of a "liberal education" expanded during the nineteenth century, and the college became its chief representative. The curriculum is therefore composed of subjects which are instrumental rather to a broad, well rounded life than to any single calling. This process was of course facilitated by the separation of vocational curricula in distinct schools, and by the indifference of college teachers to vocational interests. It is noteworthy, too, that studies which entered the college course for practical reasons tended to assume the broader function of liberal culture. This is true of modern language, economics, education, and other studies. Hence in the minds of many people the task of the college is properly, even exclusively, that of giving a liberal education. Historically, both purposes have always manifested themselves.

The practical mind of college youth is shown by the choice of subjects with reference to future professional study—for example chemistry and biology as preliminaries to medical training—and by the demand for a shortened course leading to a degree. At the same time there is impatience with studies which seem useless because not clearly related to vocational ends. Literature, history, mathematics and philosophy are regarded as futile by those who expect to graduate into a factory office, to superintend the construction of a railroad, or to deal with the specialized problems of law and medicine. Every field beside the narrow road which leads to making a living is thus likely to be regarded with disfavor, and some, particularly the classics and pure mathematics, are especially unpopular. It is not sufficiently understood that non-

vocational subjects may be "ultimately practical" in the sense of leading to an intelligent, sympathetic, self controlled and efficient life. Every student who is interested in this problem ought to grasp finally the truth that the practical business of life is much broader than the earning of a livelihood.

Unfortunately the term "culture" is equally misunderstood. Properly it signifies a general familiarity and sympathy with the studies, the literature, science and art, which represent various aspects of historical and contemporary civilization, and which consequently give the student an intelligent view of nature and human society. A broad knowledge of literature, an appreciation of works of art, and an acquaintance with the conceptions of science, these enter into the meaning of "culture." In a narrow and unfortunate usage the term is taken to indicate a snobbish propensity for "polite learning," familiarity with classical allusions, and a dabbling in art. It correctly stands for a studied and sympathetic acquaintance with humanity and with the world at large. The cultured are those who have an intelligent outlook upon all matters, refined enjoyments, and last but not least, an active idealism.⁵

Cultural and practical subjects do not fall into two distinct classes. Any study, even Indic philology, is vocational for the person who intends to teach it, and most may become instrumental to one occupation or another—literature to the editor, philosophy to the clergyman, mathematics to the engineer, the history of art to the architect, logic to the lawyer, and so on. Conversely, such vocational subjects as education, banking, household chemistry, and journalism may become the means of broadening the student's outlook upon life in true cultural fashion. Evidently the distinction between cultural and practical education depends largely upon the spirit and purpose with which a study is undertaken. The cultured mind pursues a subject for the love of it and for the resulting breadth of view. The practical mind studies for the sake of money, power, efficiency, success. Too frequently, indeed, its conception of success is narrow and selfish, but it is not

⁵ Cf. article on "Culture" in *Cyclopedia of Education*.

necessarily so. High souled professional ambition, eager to serve, indifferent to personal gain, unselfish and philanthropic,—this is far from being an unknown species of the “practical mind.” The vocational spirit may be as idealistic as the spirit of culture. In fact we find the two ideas merging in the conception of individual perfection and social service. These are ideals of culture and at the same time practical matters.

The college curriculum is therefore both cultural and vocational, liberal and practical. Its various studies lead to a broad acquaintance with nature and human affairs, and so constitute a general preparation for life, while at the same time they may be pursued with definitely occupational motives, and may possess great practical value. Some departments, no doubt, are primarily vocational; perhaps education is the best example. The curriculum as a whole, however, is predominantly cultural in character.

The vocational spirit deserves encouragement. In general the most earnest students are those who are facing the problem of their business in life, and conversely the worthless ones are for the most part those who lack a definite and determined ambition. There are exceptions, of course. The vocational idea may be nothing more than a whim, or a hope, or a passive expectation of an easy berth, in which cases it imparts no great seriousness to study. On the other hand there are natural scholars whose lifelong delight is study for study’s sake.⁶ But for the majority the root of earnest endeavor is the “life career motive.”⁷ It is interesting to observe the change which sometimes comes over a genial, happy-go-lucky fel-

*“I have never yet met with any branch of knowledge which I have found unattractive—which it would not have been pleasant to me to follow, so far as I could go; and I have yet to meet with any form of art in which it has not been possible for me to take as acute a pleasure as, I believe, it is possible for men to take.” Huxley.

⁷ It is especially significant that those who malign the “utilitarian” spirit in college education usually had a vigorous vocational purpose in their own college years. They were preparing themselves for some particular occupation, frequently that of teaching.

low in his senior year, as he realizes that sterner realities are approaching. Facing the future and preparing for it he forthwith makes a man of himself. Furthermore, college graduates who gain distinction appear as a rule to have had some vocational purpose in college, though not always that of their subsequent pursuit. Thus the practical spirit is justified by its children.

Perhaps there would be less controversy over this subject if the participants more commonly observed the distinction between training *in* a vocation and training *for* one.⁸ The former is the business of the technical and professional school, the latter may well be included in the purpose of the college. In other words the vocational ideal may be so broad that it virtually approximates the cultural ideal. With this understanding of terms we can pass the same condemnation upon the narrow mindedness which sees no value in fields of study aside from the path of practical pursuit, and upon the academic "culture" which fails to face man's duty in the world, or consists of a superficial acquaintance with literature and art. One's special interest is after all a part, even if a dominant part, of a larger experience; and it needs a background of intelligent familiarity with various aspects of nature and human life. These give it breadth of scope and usefulness, while on the other hand it unifies what would otherwise be an incoherent collection of unrelated studies. In President Butler's striking phrase, what the world needs and what the college should produce is "broad men, sharpened to a point."⁹

⁸ President Tucker points out this distinction. *The Problems of the Historic College*, *Educational Review*, May, 1912, pp. 440, 441.

⁹ *The Meaning of Education*, p. 147.

CHAPTER VI

THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

Fields of Study

The college curriculum is descended from the so-called "seven liberal arts" of the medieval university, the *trivium* of grammar, rhetoric and dialectic, and the *quadrivium* of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music. This range of study was of course altered and amplified in the development of university education, at Oxford and Cambridge as elsewhere. In the first American colleges, as we have seen, the curriculum assumed a form substantially like that of English university instruction in the same period. It comprised classical languages, philosophy and theology, a little history and smatterings of science. Latin was its official tongue, and it included much rhetorical training. Various motives, mostly of a practical sort, forced its expansion into a form corresponding to the breadth of contemporary learning. Modern languages, physical and social sciences were added while the older studies with few exceptions remained. The standard college curriculum of to-day consists of several broad fields of study which may be tabulated as follows:

Mathematics

Natural Science

Physical Science

Physics

Chemistry

Astronomy

Geology

Biological Science

Botany

Zoology

Social Science

Economics

Political Science

Sociology

History

Language and Literature

Ancient

Greek

Latin

Modern

English

Romance

Germanic

Philosophy and Psychology

This is of course a basic rather than a complete statement. We find in many colleges the additional fields of Art and Education, the latter, indeed, is now almost universal. There are also subdivisions, extensions and combinations of science, literature and history which sometimes appear as independent departments. Thus we might add to the natural sciences mechanics, mineralogy, physical geography, physiology and anatomy; to the social sciences anthropology and archeology; to the languages and literatures several others, both European and Oriental. And still further studies are found here and there. Colleges belonging to huge universities are especially prolific in such ramifications, since the technical and professional schools surrounding the college provide numerous practical extensions of the curriculum.

These fields should not be thought of as sharply separate; they overlap and interpenetrate one another. Mathematics pervades astronomy and physics, biology runs into sociology and psychology, literature involves history and philosophy, and philosophy itself draws its material from all sources. Such titles as "astronomical physics," "organic chemistry," and "social psychology" show how different subjects blend. As a matter of departmental arrangement history and political science are frequently yoked together, as are psychology and education. Every

subject may be studied historically, that is to say with reference to its development, and all are studied more or less scientifically. Hence any division of the whole field is somewhat arbitrary,—the domain of human knowledge cannot be parcelled off into mutually exclusive states. It is rather to be regarded as an “organism,” as a living body every part of which is intimately related to and dependent upon every other part.

Science and Appreciation

Underlying the curriculum we discern two kinds of study interest, that of “science,” and another which we will call, for want of a better name, “appreciation.” By science, in the most general usage of the term, we mean painstaking study and the precise, systematic knowledge which results therefrom. It is the exact description and explanation of facts. The sciences are the various “knowledges” of special fields or kinds of fact; they are all alike permeated with the “scientific spirit” of investigation, a relentless desire to know the truth. “Appreciative interest,” on the other hand, is less exact and technical in its study of detail; it is directed especially toward the ordinary affairs of human life—art, conduct and religion; and in consequence it is distinctively characterized by its sense of the esthetic, moral and religious *value* of its objects. Whereas scientific facts and laws as such are neither good nor bad, beautiful nor ugly, but simple *are*, or in other words have only *truth*, the deeds of men and the expressions of the human mind in literature and art have a *worth* to which we respond with all sorts of feelings and with judgments of approval or disapproval. The truth value of sheer fact is thus a somewhat separable interest from esthetic, ethical and religious values. The latter are matters of appreciation.¹

¹This distinction is important. For further illustration compare our appreciation of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* with the precise discussion of sources, date of composition, disputed readings and other points of scientific interest; or our everyday sentiments, vindictive and humanitarian, toward crime and poverty with the sociological treatment of their causes and methods of

Both interests are present throughout the curriculum in varying degree. The scientific interest is most obvious in mathematics and in the natural sciences, while the appreciative point of view prevails in the fields of literature and philosophy. The social sciences and history occupy an intermediate position. It is to be noted, however, that the modern study of all subjects is scientific in method, and that the appreciative interest may be subordinated to exact investigation, as when, for example, literature is studied in a purely philological or grammatical way, or inquiry is made into the mathematical and psychological laws of musical harmony. On the other hand scientific study produces its own peculiar forms of appreciation, though the beauty of a mathematical theorem or enthusiasm in dissecting a frog may not be universally felt. But while the two interests blend in actual study they ordinarily do so in different degrees, and accordingly we find that the curriculum shows a twofold character.²

Most of our daily life, we may observe, is appreciative rather than scientific. In our family relations and our friendships, our recreations, and even to a great extent in our work we are not at all scientifically minded. Our ideas are vague and we act on a basis of feeling, habit and custom—likes and dislikes, affection, hope, trust and reverence. Much of the time we “live by faith,” whether we are aware of it or not. Our wisest guidance often comes in the form of the great fundamental truths of human nature, such as we find in the literary classics of ancient and modern times, for example the words of Jesus, the sayings of Epictetus, or Emerson’s Essays. Most of this truth was discovered and set down century upon century ago, and the appreciative study of it is still an important part of our education.

Nevertheless this is a scientific age. Not that science is prevention; or our uncritical religious faith with the searching questions now asked about origin, authority and stages of development.

²This is of course the explanation of the names “College of Arts and Sciences” and “College of Literature and Science,” which some institutions have adopted in place of the ancestral title “College of Liberal Arts.”

wholly new, for certain sciences, particularly astronomy and mathematics, are very old; and important discoveries have been made in several fields for thousands of years. But the scientific achievements of the last century, and indeed of the last forty years, far exceed those of all the preceding ages of civilization together. Nowadays there is no subject of human interest which is not touched by science. We see that all nature around us—the stars in the sky, the dew on the stone, the flower in the grass, and the spider that weaves its flat dwelling from stem to leaf—is, so to speak, living and working scientific fact and law. Familiar objects of every day life, such as electric cars, concrete buildings, steel bridges, food, clothes, books and all the numberless appurtenances of our civilization, are products of applied science. Even government, morals and religion are increasingly affected by scientific research. We cannot really understand the processes of nature or the works of man except in scientific terms. Our appreciative life as individuals is aided and corrected, our advancing culture as a people is guided, by science.

Science in the Curriculum

Mathematics is the most exact and at the same time the most abstract science; it essentially consists of deductive reasoning by the use of symbols which represent any kind of magnitude or quantity. It is supremely the science of abstract reasoning, and as such it is naturally interesting to many minds. It also has conspicuous utility for certain branches of science, particularly astronomy, physics, mechanics and the different forms of engineering; in these fields it gives command of the methods by which their special problems are solved. More generally, it bears upon our daily life, since it enables us to understand many matters of experience better than we otherwise could. Thus a grasp of geometry, trigonometry and calculus will give us a more intelligent comprehension of the approach of a comet, of the route of a trans-oceanic steamer, of the architecture of a bridge or a building, or of the basis of life insurance. Perhaps the subject ought to be presented

with more explicit reference to such facts of ordinary experience than is usually the case.

Mathematics is commonly supposed to afford the most valuable training in reasoning; indeed this is the ground for prescribing it as a college study. This opinion is largely mistaken, however. There is no general power or faculty of reasoning which applies to all subjects and which can be abstractly trained. The form of reasoning always depends upon the particular kind of subject matter; in bridge design it is of one sort, in politics it is of another. Accordingly mathematics is useful in training the mind for attacking further branches of mathematics, or other subjects in so far as they are mathematical in character; but it hardly helps us in such rational problems as selecting a course of study, predicting the outcome of a football game, dealing with a refractory child, or deciding how to spend one's vacation. In these difficulties what is needed is experience and "good judgment." It frequently, though not invariably happens that good mathematicians are successful in other, non-mathematical studies, but there is little evidence that one gains skill in the latter through increased knowledge of mathematics. This is the point at issue, and it is not proved by the fact that the brilliancy of some minds shines equally in all directions. There is no doubt that one may use mathematical study to discipline his will in patience, persistence, and other desirable qualities of character, but he may obtain the same discipline by the inevitable difficulties and drudgery incidental to any thorough pursuit. There are enough good reasons for studying mathematics without resorting to any questionable ones.

In the natural sciences we find "scientific method" in its clearest and most expert form. Careful observation of facts and explanation of them in terms of the laws of nature, the use of apparatus and experiment, hypothesis, prediction and verification, these are the methodical practices of modern science. Accordingly the natural sciences have special value in developing a scientific habit of mind.³

³ It must be acknowledged, however, that scientific training in one field does not necessarily produce a scientific attitude of

They also have vocational significance; thus chemistry and biology are prerequisite for the profession of medicine. But no less cordial a recommendation of them, at least from the standpoint of the advocate of liberal education, is the intelligent friendliness with nature which they give. The waxing and waning of the moon, the swelling of the buds in the spring and the deepening red and gold of the autumn leaf, the lonely boulder on the shore—these are typical items of every day experience which mean more to us through the study of astronomy, botany and geology. Probably our esthetic appreciation of them is not changed, but there is certainly a gain in intellectual satisfaction. Likewise our understanding of the works of civilization which surround us, the aeroplane, for example, depends upon our grasp of the scientific principles which underlie their construction.

The peculiar interest of the social sciences is due to the fact that many of our most important topics of consideration to-day are problems of human society. Industrial combination, commission government, woman's suffrage, slum conditions, penal methods, divorce legislation, not to mention numerous other equally familiar economic, political and ethical matters, have become questions of profound concern to thoughtful citizens. In all of them we feel the growing insufficiency of guidance by tradition or authority, and a growing need of intellectual control. Ultimately this control can be secured only by the most thoroughly scientific study of the nature and particular institutions of society. Present iniquitous conditions are largely the result of ignorance, hence reform must come by enlightenment. The tremendous extension of college education suggests the relation of the college curriculum to the

mind in another which is different in character. The scientist may be full of sheer prejudice in politics or religion. Several distinguished men of science have succumbed to the deceptions of crude spiritualism, and the pronouncements of others on philosophical and psychological matters with which they are not technically acquainted are sometimes remarkably absurd. On the other hand, in so far as problems of physical nature are concerned, scientific ability may be carried over into neighboring fields.

problem. The thousands of graduates who annually go forth from college halls ought to be nearest to the solution. Some become leaders, and all should be supporters of social progress. It is the function of the social sciences to enable us to take our part with a sound grasp of the laws of human nature and an intelligent view of the ideals of human society.

Appreciative Studies in the Curriculum

History is the record of human interests and achievements, the dramatic and the commonplace deeds and desires that have made up human life. Those who study it not as a mere chronology of facts, but as the evolution of great ideas and pervasive feelings, find it to be a most illuminating story of humanity. The aspirations, the conflicts, the loves and hatreds, the successes and failures of the past are substantially like our own. Grecian culture, Roman conquest and decay, medieval statecraft and ecclesiasticism, the drama of the French revolution, the constitutional development of England, the political and industrial history of our own country, all may live again in our minds, or rather we may pass imaginatively into those times as though we were actually a part of them, and emerge with a better comprehension of human nature. It is no less true that a historical perspective facilitates clear vision of contemporary affairs. Thus we understand trusts and labor unions more sympathetically and critically if we know how they originated and developed; and we form our opinions about political parties more wisely after contemplating their behavior in the past. A historical point of view, indeed, is to-day a scholarly necessity in all fields of study. For this reason the study of history possibly has a measure of disciplinary value in that it may inculcate skill in research, justice in comparing and evaluating different opinions, and a grasp of cause and effect in human affairs.

The great group of languages and literatures which constitute departmentally about a third of the college curriculum have a common purpose that is twofold: scholarly command of the language and appreciative ac-

quaintance with the literature. Let us note this more precisely with reference to its principal divisions.

Our own language has extraordinary importance in that it is the instrument by which we pursue study in all departments. Moreover in all our social intercourse, in conversation, in correspondence and in formal publication our use of English is an index of our education. The ordinary lack of command of it affords more reason for requiring study and practice than exists in the case of any other subjects in the curriculum, though it must be acknowledged that the need is mainly that of regular practice in oral speaking. We understand that training in writing good English is needed for the sake of its use in other studies, but we sometimes fail to see that training in correct speaking is even more desirable for the same reason. Formal "elocution"—that noisy and childish relative of higher education—should be replaced by reading aloud, and by practice in plain, simple oral address.⁴ Incidentally better writing will result.

English literature is the great storehouse of the best ideas and sentiments of the race. Essay and drama, fiction and poetry, biography and travel are the written embodiment of men's experiences, yes, of men's souls. They touch all phases of nature and human life and may have profound influence upon the personality of the student. From them come wisdom, broad philosophical ideas, and refined mental recreation. Perhaps the strongest recommendation that can be made for gaining a scholarly acquaintance with English literature is that it is the foundation of lifelong enjoyment; no other pursuit brings such unfailing resources for cultivation in later years. The least that may be expected as a result is a permanent superiority to the cheap superficialities of the sensational press, the florid magazine, and the rapid brilliancy of many

⁴ But let us beware of the hypersensitiveness to errors of grammar and pronunciation which feels it a pious duty to set friends and relatives right in insignificant matters. One who is affected with such critical tension needs to be reminded that the content of speech is more important than is the form, that healthy ideas may lack trained expression, and that the most lovable qualities of human nature bear no essential relation to rhetoric.

a "best seller."

Passing now to the field of foreign language, let us recall the general purposes of study—command of the language and acquaintance with the literature. The value of the latter is clear. A friendship with the world's great classics in other tongues needs no elaborate recommendation; it is well to gain this through the medium of English if not in their original form. The elementary study of language, however, should precede the college course. The earlier years are more favorable for acquiring correct pronunciation and for such memorizing as is necessary. Moreover, college study should be maturer in method and in ideas than is possible in the case of elementary language. To spend a large amount of time upon the latter is to retard one's intellectual maturity. If, however, one finds it necessary to begin a foreign language in college it is reasonable to expect him to apply more advanced powers of study to it, and thereby to accomplish the elementary work in a third to a half of the time taken in the secondary school.⁵

In the case of the ancient languages an especially acute problem presents itself. A preparatory knowledge of Greek is rare among students coming to college, and few acquire it after entering, hence there is danger of a complete loss of interest in Grecian culture as a part of the curriculum. This is unfortunate, for many roots of our own civilization are found in ancient Greece, and the achievements of this wonderful people in art and litera-

⁵ It is quite possible by earnest effort to acquire ability to read a foreign language within a year. The ordinary waste of time in obtaining only a smattering by toiling painfully through a few pages of simple French or German is a disgrace to higher education. Not infrequently it happens that after a year of instruction the student has no oral command whatever, and is nearly helpless before a page of a foreign newspaper or an article in a scientific journal. He "passes" without any considerable fund of ideas or discipline of intelligence. Incidentally we may note that the fundamental lack is often that of ability to speak. Language is primarily a means of oral communication; the normal method of learning it is that of talking and listening. A "reading knowledge" depends, to a much greater extent than is commonly supposed, upon oral training.

ture are the best that the world has known. The only preventive of further disappearance seems to be the presentation of Greek culture in English. This has already been done with regard to Hebrew. The language has long since been abandoned as a college pursuit, but the study of the Bible and of the development of the Hebrew people increases in extent and in seriousness. Possibly the Greek classics, Homer and Sophocles and Demosthenes, for example, can be presented successfully in the same way, even though they cannot be compressed into a single volume and clothed with the sanctity of religion. Certainly it is important that the study of this historic period of civilization should not disappear from the curriculum.

Much the same considerations apply to Roman culture. The deeds and thoughts, the stern prose and the poetic feeling of Cæsar, Virgil, Cicero, and Horace are decidedly worth our acquaintance. They may be adequately presented in translation, and the relief from the slow and imperfect efforts of the inept translator will give time for broader and more valuable study of the Roman people. In the case of Latin, however, good reasons for studying the language are found in its relation to modern languages, particularly our own. Latin grammar reveals the structural principles of language; and root words, through their innumerable derivatives, enlarge one's vocabulary and render it more precise. The student of the "Romance" languages invariably finds Latin of great assistance, and there can be no doubt that it has formed a basis for many a notable literary "style." As a disciplinary study, apart from the relations just indicated, its value is largely fictitious; like mathematics it fails to afford discipline except to those who do not need it. Latin, or speaking more broadly, Roman civilization, is quite dignified enough to deserve study for its own sake. Perhaps classes will have fewer students, but their intelligent appreciation will compensate for loss of numbers.

Finally, the college curriculum includes studies which deal with the nature of the universe as a whole, and with the human self in relation to it. This is the field of philosophy. Idealism, materialism, agnosticism, evolution-

ism are some of the more familiar terms indicating philosophic world views. Through its breadth of scope philosophy serves to show the relations of different fields of knowledge to one another, and to organize them into a unitary whole. Here also we find the exact study of mind, and the consideration of moral and religious interests. College students instinctively desire, as reflective mankind has always desired, to understand themselves and the world order around them. A thoughtful religious belief, sane, charitable toward differing opinion, and devoted to duty, may be regarded as one of the highest accomplishments of higher education. Such a belief it is the business of philosophy to cultivate.

CHAPTER VII

THE INDIVIDUAL PLAN OF STUDY

Required Studies

From the scores or even hundreds of courses constituting the college curriculum the student takes a few, perhaps twenty or thirty at the most. He can undertake so little, and he must perforce leave so much untouched, that both he and the college authorities face the question, How may the selection best be made? To this question the general answer of American colleges is a combination of certain required studies with others chosen by the student himself. The current controversy on the subject concerns the relative merits and the proper amounts of such prescribed and elective features. Let us see if we can resolve the jangling voices into harmony.

The positive arguments for required studies are mainly two. In the first place it is held that there are certain subjects which are essential to a liberal education, subjects which it is the special business of the college to teach, and which the college graduate ought to understand. Secondly, the discipline of required study is regarded as valuable, both in the way of training the intellectual powers, and in the formation of sturdy character by habits of attacking unpleasant tasks resolutely, and forcing one's way through drudgery with patience. According to this theory the student thus equipped with a broad range of information and with a disciplined will and intelligence goes forth into society an educated man or woman.

These arguments are rejected by many as inconclusive. Just what are the essentials of a liberal education, they reply, it is impossible to say, since educational authorities differ in theory with regard to the relative value of dif-

ferent subjects, and college faculties vary widely in their practice of making requirements.¹ In view of the vast extension of modern knowledge the studies which have traditionally been prescribed seem now to have less importance; it is absurd to suppose that mathematics, Latin and philosophy are more indispensable to education than economics, history, biology and other subjects. But as soon as we try to embrace all modern learning in a prescribed scheme, we find the task hopeless. Required study of the elementary matters would prevent advanced study, and the college would have to abandon nine tenths of its varied teaching. Moreover we must acknowledge that not all students need the same prescription. Natural aptitudes and deliberate purposes certainly deserve respect. One student will obtain from general reading what another should study in a more regular way. Differences of intellectual maturity likewise suggest appropriate differences of treatment. And finally we must distinguish between prescribing a study, for example English literature, and prescribing a particular course which happens to be given under that title. What atrocious pedagogy has sometimes been forced upon helpless youth in the name of culture! It is no great exaggeration to say that the internal conditions of a required course are usually so unfavorable that a majority of students emerge with no more command of the subject than they might have obtained in a few hours of real study.

Nor is the alleged disciplinary value acknowledged. The idea of general intellectual discipline, it is said, is so weakened by current criticism that we can hardly base a system of requirements upon it; there are no subjects

¹ In the partly required, partly elective curricula, as found in colleges all over the country, striking differences appear. In a few instances English composition is the only requirement; in others considerably more than half the entire course is prescribed. The particular prescription varies, however, and in general fails to reveal clear principles. Often it is a compromise between deference to educational traditions and the demands of modern educational advances. For illustrations of such discrepancies see Foster, *Administration of the College Curriculum*, Ch. IX.

which train the memory or the reason for general application. And the discipline of the will, though quite possible, may be obtained equally well in other subjects. As a matter of fact, prescribed courses do not produce satisfactory results in this respect; they are very frequently the accepted ground for shirking, subterfuge, and even dishonesty. On account of the unwieldy size of classes, the discouragement of overworked teachers, and the constant competition of more interesting matters, they tend to become futile, farcical, harmful. Thus the negative.

Whatever the merits of this debate, the tendency of the times is clear. A particular course of study of the English language is usually prescribed, perhaps by reason of the universal use of English throughout the curriculum, and the ordinary lack of exact and fluent command of it. Apart from this, however, particular prescriptions are frustrated by difference of opinion as to what to prescribe, and in consequence are giving way to a more general requirement that the student shall gain acquaintance with a few broad fields of knowledge. Graduation is accordingly conditioned upon the study of literature, natural science, social science, and perhaps other subjects; but the precise direction and extent of study in each of these fields remains a matter of the student's choice.

The Elective System

The modern college curriculum is predominantly elective.² The principal reasons for this are the following: (1) The growth of the curriculum has made some kind of individual choice of its offerings necessary. There is an overwhelming number of subjects, all really worth studying; modern knowledge, especially in scientific form, has multiplied its riches tremendously. A single department may offer twenty to thirty courses—enough to occupy the entire time of a student for five or six years. In many cases the total of possibilities afforded by the

²In application the elective system is necessarily limited not only by conflicts of hours and other extraneous conditions, but also by the dependence of advanced courses upon earlier ones. The actual freedom of the student is less than is sometimes supposed.

college amounts to a century or more of study at the usual rate of fifteen hours of class exercise per week. These subjects are for the most part so related to contemporary life, directly or indirectly, that they are properly matters of collegiate instruction. How is this instruction possible except through the elective system? (2) The student knows best what, and with whom, he needs to study. If a course is really valuable he will gladly elect it if he can, for students keenly appreciate courses which are genuinely educative. Moreover, it is of great importance for one to have the opportunity to select his instructors, since the inspiration to real study often comes from the instructor's personality quite as much as from the contents of the course. (3) Most persons devote themselves more earnestly and successfully to matters of their own choosing than to what is prescribed, partly because they have a conscious purpose in the former case which is likely to be lacking in the latter, partly because the peculiarly unpleasant atmosphere of compulsion produces an infection of resistance. Scholarly persistency and thoroughness develop spontaneously from within; they cannot be forcibly impressed from without. (4) On all these grounds the elective system affords a training in freedom, and this is an educational accomplishment of the highest importance. It is the business of the college to enable the individual to guide himself; he cannot achieve this except by actual practice. Of course the regime of freedom implies the possibility of mistake and abuse, but on the whole it justifies itself in its human products.

On the other hand we find numerous antagonists of the elective systems urging these objections. (1) It is not a "system" at all. In application it lacks unity; it encourages the selection of subjects which are unrelated to one another or to any central purpose. The student registers for English Literature 4 because his adviser suggests it, avoids Chemistry 9 because it meets at four o'clock in the afternoon, gravitates toward History 13 because of the instructor's propensity for telling stories, and in his senior year joins the goodly company in Art 1 for the sake of its cultural value and lack of hard work. He

finally graduates with a few scraps of information but without proficiency in anything or a broad knowledge of the main fields of study. (2) The elective system fosters "snap courses" and corresponding habits of negligence. The many loafers who look for lines of least resistance not only find them, but naturally communicate their attitude to other students, thereby lowering further the standard of scholarship in particular courses and in the college at large. (3) Among seriously minded persons the elective system makes for specialization and vocational technique rather than for breadth. It permits one to ignore subjects which belong to liberal culture, while it encourages premature intensiveness. One selects what he thinks he needs in preparation for medicine or business and passes by whole fields of rich human interest without a glance; or perhaps he pursues some narrow path of scholarship year after year until he has taken eight or ten courses in chemistry but no literature, or has devoted himself so exclusively to philosophy or history that he has never even visited a scientific laboratory. Instructors, it is said, take advantage of the special interest of the few to present their subjects after the fashion of profound and recondite scholarship, not in a broadly educative way. Accordingly the elective system points toward the graduate or professional school, not toward life.

So runs the debate. In general, however, the elective system may be regarded as firmly established—mainly for the reason that it affords the only rational solution of the problem of opening the wide range of modern learning to the college student, and of meeting the variety of individual needs, purposes and abilities. Expansion of the curriculum has made the principle of free choice indispensable. Undoubtedly this principle has been abused, and possibly it needs to be limited by a few broad requirements which will serve to prevent such abuse, but on the whole, like freedom in political life and in religion, it has justified itself. Particular choices could often be improved, but no set of particular requirements would improve the total working of the elective system. For the majority there is no surer guidance than their own deliberate re-

flection.³

This is not to deny that a serious difficulty confronts the student in choosing his courses. The elective system presupposes that he knows what he needs, and whether a particular course will prove satisfactory; but unfortunately both conditions are sometimes lacking, and in consequence there are mistakes and waste of time, not to mention deliberate abuse of opportunities. How may these evils be avoided, and choice be made intelligent and fruitful?

Right guidance is found in one's natural and acquired interests, in vocational purposes, in the stimulating influence of an instructor, in catalog statements about courses, in the counsel of an official or unofficial adviser, and most importantly in the reputation of a course among older students. Two things are requisite: the college must give all the information it can, and the student must confront the problem thoughtfully. In general these conditions are sufficient. If, nevertheless, some blunder along in a wayward, pointless fashion, the fault is not that of the elective system.⁴

³ Much of the current criticism of the elective system is strangely superficial. It ignores the fact that the historical development of the curriculum has burst all restricting bounds. It calmly assumes that requirements work successfully, in defiance of the fact that required studies display most of the evils of electives in addition to some that are distinctly their own. It ignores the statistical inquiries which show that as a rule the student chooses his subjects with reasonable breadth and earnest purpose. It exhibits the chronic vice of criticism, exclusive attention to exceptional cases. It overlooks the huge classes, the poor instruction, the lack of personal direction, the competing interests outside of study, and all the other causes of shirking and failure, and blames, not these external conditions or the administration which tolerates them, but the elective system. And in conclusion it is absurdly unable to say precisely what should replace this.

⁴ A very commendable practice is that of having instructors give general lectures about their respective fields. I recall one such series of addresses in which members of the faculty spoke helpfully concerning the problems of psychology, the relation of sociology to advancing civilization, the practical significance of the study of education, the peculiar interests of mathematics and zoology and philosophy and literature. In addition to the

As a matter of fact, students are fairly judicious. Capricious election is relatively rare.⁵ The opportunities are clearly too important to be treated lightly; and accordingly the majority survey the field deliberately, and proceed with reference to purposes which are on the whole wise. The principal mistakes are the failure to appreciate the value of a broad, well rounded education, and an indifference to unfamiliar subjects. In some there is excessive specialization, in others an excessive scattering of energies in superficial excursions into many departments. For the avoidance of these errors, as we have said, general requirements are possibly needed.

Breadth and Specialization

Higher education ideally consists in an intelligent acquaintance with the various fields of modern culture, and a more thoroughly mastery of some one of them. These requisites are so important that many colleges make them conditions for graduation.⁶ In any case the individual plan of study ought to include them, and by reason of the student's good sense it usually does. Let us consider them a little more fully.

information, there was also the obvious advantage of making the acquaintance of the instructor.

*Of 1,757 selections of courses in Harvard College, according to the report of an investigating committee, only one sixth proved wholly or partially unsatisfactory in the subsequent judgment of those who made the choices, and the cases of dissatisfaction were found mostly among the poor scholars. (Report of the Committee on Improving Instruction in Harvard College. Birdseye, *Individual Training in Our Colleges*, p. 398.)

*In order to secure these conditions of breadth and intensiveness, colleges formerly arranged various combinations of particular subjects which they designated the "Classical Course," the "English Course," the "Scientific Course," and the like. In each of these, as the name indicates, a certain type of study interest was dominant, and there was also a prescribed variety. This form of "group system" was not successful. The rigidity of the groups had to give way to individual exceptions and accordingly their boundary lines were obliterated. A more effective method of regulation is that of the "major study," and the required distribution of electives over several groups of departments.

The curriculum naturally falls into a few grand divisions, somewhat as we have indicated in the preceding chapter. Mathematics, natural science, social science, history, literature and philosophy, these are the main intellectual interests of our civilization. Without some knowledge of them, education is not "liberal." Within each field one may choose at will physics or chemistry, economics or political science, one literature or another. Many fundamental ideas and methods of study may be obtained in one subordinate department as well as in another, and the student is sure to find pathways from his chosen field opening into adjacent ones. But every one should study some part of nature scientifically; every one should learn to look upon society as embodying great natural laws; every one should acquire a historical point of view and perspective; every one should cultivate an appreciation of good literature, with its burden of esthetic, philosophical, moral and religious treasures of the mind. These studies are not merely valuable in themselves; they are valuable as aids in other study. Thus history gives the student a broader view of literature, and philosophy reveals the significance of biological and sociological problems. For this reason it is worth while to carry concurrently courses which represent several different fields.

A casual warning against "scattering" is appropriate, however. I remember earnest persons who tried to touch all fields, and hence elected so many elementary courses as to prevent advanced study in any subject. Here, they thought, was their last opportunity to "get a start"; with this they could go further at their leisure. But their motive, though intelligible, had only a specious worth. One does not need to undertake so many kinds of elementary study. With well trained powers it is possible to master not only the elements of a subject but a good deal more in less time than that of a college course,—if, that is to say, one has time and interest for such study in later life. If not, the elementary study will prove to be of little value; most of its details and technique slip easily away from the mind unless followed up. It is better, therefore, to go more deeply into a few subjects. Their

conceptions and methods will enable us to enter new fields, either in the way of systematic study or in general reading.

Breadth of vision, without superficiality, is thus a quality of mind at which the user of the elective system should aim. But equally important is the intensive cultivation of some one study interest, the concentration upon a "major study." This essentially implies a scholarly grasp of a subject, not only of its elements and leading ramifications, but of some advanced branch; in mathematics, for example, such advanced work would include certain extensions and applications of the calculus, in literature a thorough study of one writer or of a particular period of literary development, in science the understanding or perhaps even the prosecution of some research, in philosophy a course in metaphysics, and so on. It may be confined to a single department, or range more widely over adjoining fields. In amount the major ordinarily varies from a third to a sixth of the entire course.

The value of such intensive or concentrated study is proved by the common testimony of students that their major was the most satisfactory feature of their whole course. It prevented desultory scattering of interest and the dissipation of intellectual energy over a wide but shallow extent of elementary studies; and it formed a kind of backbone for organic educational development. They discovered that other subjects really bore upon it, and that it in turn gave new meaning to them. It was like a tower from which they could survey the whole domain of human knowledge. Moreover it afforded training in thorough, masterful work. The subject itself might be useful—English to the journalist, philosophy to the clergyman, economics to the man of business, and any subject to the teacher—but quite as important was the method and habit of patient study. It is a striking fact that success in life comes for the most part to those who have distinguished themselves in college by concentrated study in some chosen field. This was not always in the line of their later work; indeed there is ground for thinking that apart from a certain saving of time it does not make much

difference what subject is chosen for a major. Men of diverse callings have concentrated their attention in college upon the same subject, and conversely men of the same profession have specialized in fields as far apart as biology and Greek. The significant acquisition was the intensive method, the ability to investigate a matter, and the resulting consciousness of power.

Undergraduate specialization involves a real danger, however. It is impossible to devote oneself thoroughly to anything without relatively neglecting other things; and such neglect, in the case of college study, may become altogether too complete. One tends to become oblivious to other responsibilities and justifies himself on the ground that his interest is in his major. He may even make his college course almost exclusively a study in one department, and graduate with immense ignorance of others.⁷ We should remember that specialization as such produces only specialists, that breadth of interest and information is very desirable as a background of specialization, and that specialists of the first rank are usually men of such breadth. The college is the only institution of higher education which educates broadly. In a way this is its main purpose, which it fulfils both for the sake of breadth of mind and for the power which this adds to specialization. The importance and fascination of the major ought not to obscure this fact.

⁷The ideal of a liberal education constantly faces two main forms of hypertrophied specialization—social and athletic specialization outside the curriculum, vocational specialization within. The latter includes the undergraduate specialization in problems of research conducted by enthusiastic instructors who are themselves research specialists. Under the elective system the college does not force a liberal education upon the student; he must win it for himself.

CHAPTER VIII

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF STUDY

Amount

Critics of the college, both without and within its walls, charge that there is altogether too little study in its daily life. On the other hand there are defenders who hold that college students study quite as much as is good for them;—most of the students themselves are probably of this mind! Just what, rationally considered, is the proper amount of study?

College teachers have a common opinion that an hour of class work ought to require two hours of preparatory or supplementary study. This is regarded, of course, as a standard or good average. It is acknowledged that students vary in study power; one spends only half an hour on a task which occupies another two or three hours apparently without greater gain. But such individual differences, it is held, do not invalidate the above rule as the one to which in general the student should conform. If, as is usual, he takes courses amounting to fifteen hours a week, his total study time including class periods is forty-five hours, or an average of seven and a half hours a day for six days. The customary practice is scientific courses which involve laboratory work increases the time required. If Saturday is used partially or wholly for other purposes the deficiency must be made up on Sunday or the daily schedule lengthened to nine or ten hours.¹

Stated in figures such an expectation may seem reasonable, and in fact it is met by occasional hard working

¹ Substantially this conclusion is reached by Canfield (*The College Student and his Problems*, pp. 73, 74) and Adams (*Making the Most of One's Mind*, p. 40).

persons who regularly devote ten hours a day to study. But such a diligent routine is rare. It is far indeed from being the usual practice of college students. Investigation of the actual study habits shows conclusively that the amount of time spent on a course outside the classroom averages hardly more than the number of class hours. "Hour for hour" seems to be the general rule.²

Nor is it difficult to see why there is so little. There is commonly a lack of clear purpose in life, and consequently of a constant feeling that one must study in order to succeed. In addition, the complex character of college life with its incessant distractions, its diversified opportunities for physical and mental recreation, its lectures, social gatherings, musical and dramatic entertainments, and the like, militates strongly against high standards of study. Furthermore the size of classes, the lecture method, the impossibility of conducting recitations or of reading hundreds of written pages, and the instructor's devotion to his own study interests, all tend to lessen the student's sense of responsibility. He acquires a comfortable assurance that he does not really need to spend a great deal of time in preparation for classes. An occasional glance at a book and a few hours of cramming just before an examination serve the purpose of passing the course as well as a semester of steady labor.

Faculty expectation and student performance are thus far apart. Is the discrepancy to be removed simply by requiring more study? Partly, no doubt. Precisely this is taking place in many colleges at the present time. Higher standards and improved methods are replacing those which have given cause for criticism, and the result is that the college is a more studious place than formerly.

² Such was the result of an inquiry at Harvard College a few years ago, and there is no reason for supposing the condition to be extraordinary. (See Birdseye, *Individual Training in Our Colleges*, Appendix VIII.) The writer once secured from seventy students detailed statements of their actual study hours for a period of two weeks. They regarded themselves, and were regarded by their instructors as exceptionally industrious, but their figures showed a general average only slightly in excess of the number of class hours.

The theoretical standard indicated above is not likely to be reached, however. As a daily average it is probably excessive. Assuming that "study" means genuine intellectual effort, we must acknowledge the fact that eight to ten hours of it are so taxing and wearing as to be dangerous to health. In particular, the strain upon the eyes, the attention, and the associative mechanism of the brain is likely to produce nervous instability. Most students naturally obey their health instincts in this matter and stop before the point of mental overwork is reached, but the cases of nervous breakdown, though infrequent, nevertheless constitute a warning of what would happen more often if the theory in question were actually practiced.

Furthermore, the theory is incompatible with the interest of the college in other matters than courses of study. Not only athletics, but also literary and debating societies, dramatics, musical clubs and many similar organizations would languish. Some critics will say of course that this is devoutly to be wished, but most of us would regard the demise of these interests as unfortunate. Obviously, too, the possibility of outside work, upon which a large percentage of students depends in some measure for support, would be seriously curtailed.

Undoubtedly college students ought to study more than they do, but the main defect is in quality rather than in quantity. The need is not so much for more hours of study as for better mental habits, for trained minds which can attack a study task skillfully, proceed through it with a minimum of wasted time and effort, and then turn to something else. With such ability six to eight hours of study should be sufficient.

Let us observe, however, that this point of view signifies real intellectual concentration. In the classroom it means persistent attention to the subject of the hour, steady note-taking or thought and discussion—not mere superficial listening to a lecture or mind-wandering in passive resignation to a tedious lapse of time. In private study it likewise means concentration upon book or essay or apparatus—not dawdling over these, or gazing out of

the window, or sitting with three friends at a table and alternating short periods of half attentive reading with animated conversation about current athletic and social affairs. The hardest thing for many of us to do is to stick patiently to an intellectual task. On the other hand study does not mean pegging away, dully and hopelessly, when the tired brain refuses to work. That is the time for rest—a few minutes intermission, an hour of physical exercise, an evening at the theater or a sound night's sleep.

An extension of our problem presents itself with regard to the distribution of our time among our studies. Do they deserve equal periods, or is it better to devote a disproportionate amount to one, even though this involves relative neglect of others? In my opinion the latter alternative is the wiser, provided of course that we do not neglect any subject to the point of failure. Concentration of energy is so important as a matter of training, skill in intensive study is so indispensable to the professional worker, that we ought to make it our first rule to do something thoroughly—to do it just as well as we can. Selecting that subject which is most interesting, or prospectively most profitable, or it may be most difficult for us, we should proceed to master it. If our natural gifts are such as to bring A's in all subjects, so much the better; in any case let us try to do A grade work in something. The second rule is of course to work hard enough in every subject to derive some real advantage from it.

We must not leave this topic without reminding ourselves of the warning fact that for many walks of life to which college education leads it is no longer the royal road. Not only the technical and professional schools which do not require collegiate preparation, but also a tremendous growth of evening and correspondence schools have brought into the field of competition thousands of earnest students many of whom are daily adding to the labor by which they earn their bread several hours of successful study. Some, indeed, are spending more time in study than the average college student, and against heavy odds are advancing themselves in a way which puts the college loafer to

shame. The hard headed, unsentimental world, which does not respect a college education except upon grounds of efficiency, is likely to pay little attention to the varnish of culture and much to the solid substance of trained ability.³

Regularity

One of the busiest students I have known—and one of the happiest—had a daily schedule almost as precise as that of a railroad train. Occasionally she found herself compelled to divide a part of her time into fifteen minute periods, each of which had its particular occupation. Work and play, classes, chapel, committee meetings, secretarial duties, fun and frolic flowed by in a steady stream. The amount of work she accomplished was no less remarkable than her capacity for recreation; she was an extraordinary illustration of the value of a well regulated life.

Regularity is important for several reasons—in the first place because it enables us to do a great deal more than we otherwise would. A multitude of things to do is likely to result in nothing done. We contemplate them in distress or pass from one to another in futile effort to take hold anywhere. Whatever is distasteful in tasks appears much more forbidding if there is no compelling *now* to force a beginning. We worry over the fact that we are not doing anything, and thereby make it all the harder to begin, for worry is misdirected attention and wasted energy. We tire out the will by spasmodic attempts to make up our mind to do something, just as we exhaust ourselves physically by misapplied muscular strain. Routine, on the other hand, is economy of intellectual and volitional effort. A definite hour for a task helps to make it possible, and the irksomeness of beginning drudgery quickly yields to methodical attack. Having overcome our initial inertia by force of habit we accomplish more, suffer less nervous wear and tear, have more time for play, and increase our general happiness.

³ For facts concerning the development of correspondence schools see Birdseye, *Individual Training in Our Colleges*, Ch. XXI.

How indispensable the principle of regularity is in the industrial world every one knows. There, indeed, most tasks are made matters of routine to the point of extreme monotony. One great danger incidental to the development of industry is that its processes shall be so subdivided and drearily repeated that the worker becomes a mere machine. There is no danger of this extreme in college life, however; here matters are so varied and elastic that irregularity is almost inevitable, and the main difficulty is that of establishing any definite schedule at all.⁴

But routine is not an agreeable thought to our unreflective selves; we are likely to prefer a more spontaneous method of procedure. It is true, too, that in some fields we find great works accomplished by fits of inspiration and bursts of energy. This is the irregular practice of genius—Wait for the right moment and then work!—and it is dramatically fascinating. But its feasibility is largely confined to the field of art, and even here it is not the whole story. The general rule for the student is of a different sort. Our efficiency depends upon making out a schedule and sticking to it as closely as possible, certainly not in postponing duties until the eleventh hour. The kind of inspiration which comes on the night before a thesis is due not likely to be so valuable as the ideas we form when we undertake it in a more deliberate way. I know that in my own case the days in which I accomplish most are those in which I work according to schedule, and that they are also the most satisfactory days. Is it not a fact, too, that the graduates of technical and professional schools owe their superior efficiency in part to methodical habits of work, habits imposed upon themselves under penalty of failure?

But our difficulty may be, not a lack of appreciation of the value of regularity, but skill in establishing it in our lives. We know that we do not have too much to do, if we could only hit upon a working method. But our efforts have not been crowned with success. Perhaps we are not naturally inclined to work in such a fashion, and

⁴“Routine,” says Phillips Brooks, “is a terrible master, but she is a servant whom we can hardly do without.”

it is easily possible to experiment in a way that is foredoomed to failure. Accordingly one who is trying to regulate his time more efficiently does well to bear certain principles in mind.

The fundamental requisite is that we should definitely set hours for the most necessary or important matters, let us say three or four main periods of study and recreation in addition to appointed classes. As a general rule about three hours in the morning and shorter periods in the afternoon and evening ought to be expressly devoted to study and class work. Many of us find the morning hours more favorable to certain kinds of study, whereas if we postpone such tasks they take much longer. It is of course especially wise not to defer all study until the evening. When mental weariness increases or gaiety beckons, hope looms large that shrewdness or luck may avoid disaster next day, and the end is that one says "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof," and goes to bed. It is astonishing, too, how much we can accomplish by takings things in time and under the most propitious conditions. They "get done" with automatic regularity, leaving plenty of opportunity for recreation. Hence the best plan is to make a schedule, perhaps for a single day at a time, comprising a few principal features, and stick to it unless something really important intervenes.

A common experience is that of formulating an exact schedule for a whole day from rising to bedtime, and learning speedily that human affairs cannot proceed with such precision. A particular task obstinately stretches itself over time which does not belong to it, an unexpected matter claims our attention, street cars are late, or what not, and the whole system goes awry. Routine appears impossible, and we fall back into our old ways. Hence it is wise to provide for contingencies by simply laying out the main divisions of our time in accordance with our most important duties, thereby leaving "margins" for unavoidable delays. Little and relatively unimportant things must fit in where they can. It is especially unwise to try to do the little things first; they use up so much energy that the bigger ones are likely to remain undone.

Resoluteness is at least as important a factor of success as is skill in arrangement. Wherever one spends his study hours, at home or in a dormitory or elsewhere, there are sure to be interruptions, interferences and distractions. One must accustom himself to working steadily in spite of these; and particularly one must learn to withstand the temptation to indulge at all times in conversational good fellowship—the friendly loafing which is distinctly worth while, but not in study hours. Regularity often requires sheer will power. Periods of study, set and supervised by school authorities, do not exist in college, and it is better that they should not. The problem is essentially one for the student to solve for himself. Fraternities and dormitory groups may lessen the difficulty by establishing house rules, so that intruders may be firmly repelled or dispassionately thrown out, but generally speaking the individual must make his own rules, and insist upon observance. The ability to stick to one's schedule is a test of strong character.

Any schedule must be more or less elastic, however. Interferences will occur, and no matter how methodical we try to be, we shall find ourselves obliged to make occasional exceptions. Skill in doing this without abandoning the main lines of our purpose or breaking up regular habits is a part of the task. Nevertheless we may learn to fit our affairs into an orderly sequence when all the forces of college life seem to conspire for its disruption.

Freedom

This aspect of college study deserves special notice. The college atmosphere is or should be an atmosphere of "freedom." What does this mean?

It means in the first place freedom from constant supervision, from minute rules and regulations; it means the opportunity to study or not to study, as one pleases. A watchful regime, as we have seen, characterized the early colleges, and is still the practice of lower schools, though secondary schools have modified it extensively. The modern college has outgrown it. In higher education it goes without saying that no one keeps close watch of

the student's daily work or habits of study; instructors are sometimes indifferent, indeed, whether the student studies regularly or not—if he does he passes, if he doesn't he fails. In any case the responsibility rests with the student rather than with the teacher.

But this points to an obvious danger, for freedom essentially implies that one may go wrong as well as right. It is possible not only to do a great deal of shirking, but also to conceal this adroitly, and with a little superficial polish to pass examinations. No one seems to care to make us study, every college has "snap courses," and perhaps our good intentions are discouraged by unhelpful teaching. We find that we can drift along through the four years and even graduate without having developed habits of hard work. Meanwhile other matters are more attractive. But during the senior year if not earlier the matter is likely to present itself in a different light; an inevitable alternative of work or worthlessness appears, and we realize that freedom means something more than the absence of rules and compulsion.

Freedom means legislation for oneself—the deliberate determination upon our own ideals, and the persistent, regulated effort to realize these. Just so a free country is not one without laws, but one which makes its own laws and obeys them. This positive kind of freedom is fundamental in all healthy college life. The value of the elective system and of various other features of college education is that they help to develop habitual obedience to an ideal rather than to an external authority; that they teach one to impose rules upon himself instead of being pushed and pulled along by force. This freedom, as we have seen, involves the possibility of abuse, and sometimes brings failure as well as success; but our faith is that it brings more success than failure, and that it is an indispensable condition of individual upbuilding and of social progress. Current criticism of the new order and advocacy of the old fashioned disciplinary regime often fail to take account of this aspect of the matter. That is why we cannot accept such criticism, but prefer freedom, even with its excesses and failures, to the older practice. Only

let us not lose sight of the fact that freedom, in order to justify itself, must be, not freedom from law, but freedom through self imposed law.

An especially good opportunity for the exercise of such freedom may be found in courses which leave the student largely to his own devices, and more particularly in those which are burdened with an uninteresting method. Instead of taking advantage of conditions to abandon the course or to shirk one's way through it, suppose one asks, "What law can I reasonably impose upon myself for my own education in this matter? Disregarding the instructor and his method, can I, alone or with others, make this subject worth while by systematic regulating my own efforts?"—I have known students to undertake this mastery of unfavorable conditions successfully; and I hardly need add that they changed disgust and worry into tolerance and the joy of accomplishment. Such independence is true freedom.

There was, in my own college experience, a certain course of study which for futility of method has probably seldom been surpassed in the history of American higher education. Most of us got through it by hook or crook, practices which did us no good whatever and which were partially dishonest. The general conditions of freedom made it easy to slip by, and we justified ourselves by various sophistries. I recall, however, that one of us proceeded in an independent, good humored way to make the course one of real study. He shaped his own ideal, and at the end of the year emerged with a grasp of the subject which the rest of us lacked, and which I for one still desire.

We may refer here to a psychological law. Professional habits—and this includes the habit of independent, systematic, concentrated work—are incipiently formed in the years from eighteen to twenty-five; the process of formation is practically over by the age of thirty. Evidently, then, the period of college education is important in this respect. While it is possible under inexorable conditions to form such habits after graduation, and while college graduates are sometimes compelled to do this, the adjust-

ment is difficult for one who has not already laid the foundation. Professional habits are much less likely to be fixed in straight, clean grooves if the college course has run in a wayward, slipshod manner, greased by good nature rather than energized by will and guided by intelligence. The counterpart of the "survival of the fittest"—that law of nature which none of us can evade—is the failure and perhaps degradation of the unfit. For this reason the particular subjects we study in college are relatively unimportant, as such, in comparison with the development of freedom in the sense of self reliance and an intelligent method which we can apply to the affairs of later life.

CHAPTER IX

ELEMENTARY FACTORS OF STUDY

Interest

Study depends upon interest;—realization of this fact is one of the basic features of modern educational theory. We study a subject because we are impelled by a curious feeling that we want to know more about it. Sometimes the subject is “naturally” interesting to us; sometimes it would be dull if we did not see that it leads to something valuable, in which case it has a “derived” interest. Many of us, for example, found tennis so naturally interesting that we studiously tried to perfect ourselves in playing it, whereas we took an interest in a railroad advertisement only because we were planning a vacation trip. Generally speaking we all are naturally interested in other people, especially those with whom we are closely associated; we are interested in living nature—animals, flowers, trees; we are interested in what we can do, particularly what we can do with skill or power, and consequently in our vocation. And from these interests a multitude of others are derived.

In the earlier years of childhood study is for the most part a matter of obedience to the teacher, of fear of punishment or desire for reward, rather than a matter of intellectual interest. In the kindergarten the natural play interest is turned to account in developing study habits. As the pupil advances new natural interests appear, and derived interests likewise increase. A few individuals display a natural intellectual curiosity which applies to all subjects, but most are in need of some other motive, and if they do not find one report their studies as “uninteresting.” The tremendous growth of high schools has

intensified the problem of what the pupil at this stage really wants and needs to study. The most conspicuous tendency at the present time is that of inducing interest by relating studies to the conditions of actual life, and particularly by introducing "vocational" studies into the curriculum.

In college study we observe the working of the same principles: natural and derived interests are the motive forces. Most students are provided with natural study interests of some sort; those who lack these ought not to be in college. Such interests may be latent or undiscovered, but under appropriate conditions they come to light, as when a lecture, a visit to a laboratory, or a casual conversation with a friend reveals the desirability of history or physics or sociology. We ought indeed occasionally to attend classes in untouched subjects in order to give these sparks of natural interest an opportunity to flame up. Appreciative interests, dealing directly with "real life" are all but universal; hence the large classes in government and biology. The purely intellectual interest of science is less common. Apparently it does not arise until relatively late, and if prematurely forced upon the student it takes the form of irksome drudgery, the perfunctory performance of experiments or learning of facts about which he cares not a whit.

Many of our studies are sure to be due to some derived interest. A student with a distaste for mathematics reconciles himself to it because of its bearing upon engineering, which is his intended vocation. Another studies philosophy because it illuminates the problems of religion, and a third elects history or literature as a part of a "liberal education." But the derivation of an interest is not always so rational. Sometimes it is simply friendliness with another student or personal regard for a teacher which lures one into a particular path.¹ Fortunately derived interests often gain the force of natural ones, as closer acquaintanceship reveals the truth and value of what is studied.

¹ A frank acquaintance once confessed that he took up philosophy to escape appearing as an ignoramus when the dinner table conversation turned to philosophic subjects.

Interest must occasionally be reenforced by discipline, however, and in college this discipline must be for the most part self imposed. No matter how much we may like a subject, there will inevitably come moments when it seems lifeless or futile, and when we are tempted to desert it in favor of something else. There is a certain type of student—if indeed he deserves the name—who feels a spasmodic interest in this or that pursuit, but who lacks sufficient force of character, when he encounters its dull details, to drive himself through them. So he scatters his energies, ever turning from a disagreeable path to a new one, and, as the record books clearly show, doing poorly in all. When the subject matter of study becomes monotonous there is no salvation except in the disciplined will. We must “take an interest” by sheer effort, setting ourselves to work resolutely upon the task that we know needs to be done. The bearing of this truth upon required courses is clear. Because the factor of spontaneous natural interest is originally lacking they have a fatal tendency to become uninteresting, and we can overcome their irksomeness only by deliberately interesting ourselves in them.

Attention

Attention makes an object clear by excluding other things from view, and, so to speak, letting all the light of intelligence shine upon a particular point. Sometimes it is “sensory,” sometimes “intellectual.” The former is attention which is directed to sounds, colors, tastes, pressure, pain, and to objects which are made up of such “sense stimuli.” Intellectual attention is concentration upon memories, anticipations, hopes, fears, fancies and abstract ideas. The two kinds of attention may be blended, as in ordinary reading, when we look at the print but constantly think of its meaning.

Attention is also “voluntary” or “involuntary.” It is involuntary when a sight or sound compels us to look or listen, or when a thrilling story carries us from page to page. Voluntary attention is an effort of the will. Children show little of it; their attention flies spontaneously from one thing to another, successfully claimed by every

new object or occurrence. Education of course gives training in this respect. Year by year the pupil learns to put his mind more fully at work upon a task, in disregard of the distractions which formerly interfered so easily. Intellectual maturity is characterized by its power of sustained voluntary attention. In business or public affairs the persons who daily accomplish many things do so by their trained power of attending steadily to one at a time.

Study attention in college is evidently of a voluntary-intellectual sort. As students we attend to ideas, and only incidentally or instrumentally to sense objects. This is true even in the laboratory where concrete facts reveal to the observer the larger truth which we call natural law. Dominant study interests have reference to principles and theories, to the past and future, to values which are not immediately present to the senses. This abstractness and distance of our objects implies that our attention must be resolutely maintained by will. Desirable as it is to undertake our work in the spirit of play, of freedom, of artistic pleasure, and to be absorbed in it through interest, we have to acknowledge that neither college study nor life in general permits such exercise without effort. Grit is an essential requisite of study, and "attention to business" depends upon self control. It would be well if college entrance requirements included an unmistakable test of ability to sustain intellectual attention by voluntary effort.

The average college class, especially a class of freshmen, displays a conspicuous lack of trained attentive power. If someone opens a window half the eyes in the room turn to watch the operation, even though it is perfectly familiar and unimportant. If two or three good friends are gathered about a library table it is highly probable that, in spite of the book before each, a considerable part of the time will be spent in casual conversation. It is almost impossible for some persons to study by an open window without letting their attention drift repeatedly to what is going on outside—to the sound of a voice, the passing of a carriage, the caller at the house across the street. Movements and sounds, especially those which have human

significance, naturally interest us, and we are likely to waste a good deal of time upon them unless we make ourselves oblivious to them by voluntary effort. This does not of course imply that attention should be absolutely unbroken. The strain upon the little muscles of the eye which focus our vision upon the print, and upon the machinery of the mind, should be relieved from time to time by moments of rest in which we turn from the matter in hand to something else. But these lapses should be under regular control. As students we ought to be able to hold our attention to a lecture or recitation for an hour, to stick to a theme or a problem or a solid chapter of a book for a couple of hours, pausing now and then for a bit of mental rest, but resolutely proceeding to the end. The problem of the proper amount of study is greatly simplified for one who can concentrate his mind upon his work. He finishes this and has plenty of time for other matters.

The conditions favorable to persistent attention are quiet, fresh air and an unfatigued mind. Quiet is not indispensably necessary; we may become indifferent to noise, particularly if it is monotonous. A linotype operator working in the pandemonium of a newspaper composing room or an accountant making calculations within a few feet of the rattle and bang of a city street show what can be achieved in this respect. Under the best conditions we have to cultivate a disregard of noise. Yet quiet is none the less desirable, and dormitories frequently need regulations to protect the studious from disturbance. Fresh air is requisite for properly oxygenating the blood, and particularly for maintaining the temperature at which this most easily takes place. A hot, close room is unfavorable to intellectual work. Freshness of mind is also important. Probably every one has had the experience of wearily reading a sentence over and over without being able to grasp its meaning, because the mind was too tired to make the necessary connections between words and phrases. Mental fatigue accompanies physical fatigue, hence the practice of postponing study until late hours is evidently foolish. Weariness makes the interference of passive

imagination more insidious. The explanation of many a failure is that the unfortunate could hardly help thinking about the next game, or a girl, or a fraternity exploit, when other matters deserved attention. Indifference to imaginative distraction is quite as hard to practice as disregard of sensory disturbance, but we may learn to check incipient wanderings of eye or mind.

Memory

The ability to recall facts varies greatly. Some persons have "sticky" memories which catch and hold whatever touches the mind. They possess large vocabularies in several languages; on occasion they can instantly state chemical formulæ, historical dates and masses of other fact. Once in a while a student appears to have all the material of a course at his or her fingers' ends during examination. Authentic cases are on record of persons who could repeat verbatim the contents of a daily paper after a single reading, and of clerks who could give the price of wheat or cotton in any month for many years. Before the invention of writing, and particularly before that of printing, it was necessary to make the memory a capacious storehouse of fact and fancy. There was little or no accumulation of scientific truth, but much history and poetry were passed along from generation to generation by word of mouth. The bard might compass Homeric poetry, and pious men carried in their minds many a sacred book of song and legend and chronicle before these were committed to writing. Such a power is a natural endowment, possessed by few.

This "native retentiveness," in the opinion of psychologists, is practically unchangeable; in other words no general improvement of it is possible. Committing masses of poetry to memory does not help in this respect, and the sheer memorizing of isolated dates or of words in foreign languages does not greatly facilitate further acquisition. All that one can do to "improve the memory" is to develop a sound method of grasping a fact; the holding of it, once grasped, is beyond his control.

Such a sound method of memorizing is, however, at least equally important. It consists, in the first place, of careful attention, especially if the observation is repeated and if it makes use of both eye and ear. Thus the repeated sound of a word or date or algebraic formula cooperates with observation of its visual form. Second, the fact to be remembered should be related to something already fixed in the mind. If we grasp things in their relationships, associate dates with other dates, compare or contrast the views of different men, note the derivation of several words from a single root or the resemblance of a foreign idiom to one in our own tongue, we are more likely to give these matters a permanent home in the mind.² Third, it is helpful to speak or write what we wish to retain, for we make truth our own by actual expression quite as much as by passive reception. Thus we learn declensions and conjugations by saying them over and over, and master the scientific names of wild flowers by classifying them, to our long suffering friends, in our walks afield.

Most of what we study we shall not remember—this is inevitable; and hence it is the most significant to load our mental repository with what is likely to be most needful. Into it should go the frequently useful and the fundamentally important things—the root and common words of a vocabulary, the basic rules of grammar, the chief dates of history, authoritative opinions of leading scholars, structural ideas and striking illustrations of general laws. It is happily true that if we grasp fundamental principles the multitude of particular facts will take care of themselves, either clinging like burs to the fabric of our conceptions, or else dropping away to make room for something more valuable. Once we clearly comprehend a dominating idea, such as romanticism in literature, or idealism in philosophy, or the historical conflict between church and state, we find it naturally carrying with it a sufficient amount of explanatory detail. The mass of what passes before us will be forgotten, and it is well that it should

² This is the principle of the "memory system," though this, as a rule, does little but impose upon the mind the additional burden of remembering the system.

be, provided it has served its purpose of making clear the things which we need to remember, and of developing power of thought.

A "sticky" memory is therefore not indispensable; real scholarship can work without it. Libraries, encyclopedias and other books of reference are most efficient substitutes; and skillful observation and accurate reasoning are far more important. A college is a place, indeed, where one may learn to use the higher powers of the mind, and to depend less upon mere retentiveness.

These considerations evidently apply to the subject of examinations. In so far as these depend upon memory the only effective preparation for them is that of attentive study, frequent reviews, recitation and thoughtful discussion. One may, it is true, spend a few hours in "cramming" into his head certain features of a subject, shrewdly selected by himself or by a professional tutor, and may thereby enable himself to answer the few questions which he finds on the examination paper. But because he has studied superficially, and has grasped facts in a sporadic rather than a systematically related way, his memory is likely to desert him; furthermore he has acquired no ability to deal with a problem which requires independent thinking, and if confronted with one he is helpless. In any case the hastily swallowed truth will not be mentally digested, and in consequence will not be long retained in the mind. On the other hand the knowledge and the power gained by deliberate, systematic study are lifelong possessions.

CHAPTER X

THOUGHT FACTORS OF STUDY

Advanced Study Involves Thinking

In the lower schools the pupil does little independent *thinking*; his study is more largely a process of *learning* what has been thought by some one else, or of doing things according to prescribed directions. Facts are to be memorized, rules are to be applied, and these facts, rules and applications, whether in arithmetic or language, are stated so definitely that they leave no great opportunity for thinking the matter out for oneself, even if this were possible. In the secondary school the algebra, French, history and elementary science are usually presented in precise, textbook form, somewhat "predigested," indeed, in order to bring them within range of the student's comprehension. The experiments performed in the laboratory are often little more than the blind following of directions; the experimenter does not know why he does thus and so. Where fresh analysis is required, as in the "originals" of geometry, the critical examination of an argument, the detection of the meaning of one Latin word from its resemblance to another, the unaided perception of what takes place in the growth of a plant or the explanation of the failure of an experiment, there is commonly little skill. Authoritative facts and rules are the pedagogical burden of childhood and youth.

In so far as secondary school subjects and methods are continued in college the student who has mastered the elements and routine processes marches along successfully. Sooner or later, however, he finds that higher education involves subjects in which textbook material is unavailable or inadequate. The facts of economics and history and

biology are perhaps buried in heavy volumes in the library, or poured out in lectures, or hidden away in the baffling confusion of nature herself. Study then consists of formulating a problem, disengaging the relative facts, and drawing conclusions. The student has to determine his purposes for himself, analyze what he reads or observes, and put his material together in clear and systematic form. Unless he can do this his report of the behavior of an organism, or of the working of the initiative and referendum, will not amount to much. Of course the simpler methods of earlier education, the learning and the mechanical application of rules, continue to be more or less useful, but the faculty of thinking is especially in demand. Studies which are direct continuations of secondary school subjects, such as mathematics and foreign language, introduce an increasing amount of thoughtful effort. In short, intellectual maturity is essentially a power of thinking.¹

Here is a point at which critics of the college aim their shafts. Society, they say, needs thinkers; and the college should provide these. Its training should enable the student to solve the problems, political, economic, moral, religious, which society constantly faces. But this ability depends upon scholarly thoughtfulness—and college students do not think!

The accusation, though critically exaggerated, is not without a modicum of truth. There is indeed too little thinking about college studies. The difficulty is not that

¹We have here an explanation of an interesting college phenomenon. Though in general the student's grade of scholarship in his preparatory school indicates what he will do in college, this is not always the case. Some with excellent credentials do poorly in new subjects; their transition from familiar mathematics and language to economics and psychology is accompanied by a slump. On the other hand, a mediocre student occasionally develops astonishing power upon entering a new field, and perhaps graduates as the leading biologist of his class. The reason is found in the method of advanced study and in the student's native interests and latent capabilities of independent thinking. There is hope for the incompetent in mathematics and language; he may possess rare powers of scientific or historical investigation.

students cannot or do not think;—they give plenty of earnest thought to other matters. But as regards the curriculum too many are content to conform to minimum requirements, reading, writing and reciting in a mechanical, routine fashion, without making study a vital interest. Too few formulate for themselves the problems which constitute their courses of study and which are the living forces of higher education; too few look upon these problems, or upon the learning of the past which bears upon them, as a really important matter. The result is that many a college graduate has only a superficial understanding of contemporary life, even though he has “passed” in numerous courses dealing with life’s varied concerns. No doubt there is much intellectual development apart from the curriculum, as well as much real scholarship within it; but on the whole the college does not compare favorably with the technical and professional school in respect to the amount of thoughtful attention given to subjects of study. The instructor who observes this lack of thoughtfulness feels inclined to parallel the injunction of the apostle to the Philippians, and say: Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are important, if there be any science, literature and philosophy, and any virtue in the pursuit of them, *think* on these things!

Thinking is so complex and varied an art that exact rules for it cannot be given. Like walking it is learned by actually doing it. Nevertheless we may be helped by considering some of the principal features of the process as they appear in ordinary study. The first, of course, is

Purposiveness

The more definite our aim, the more skillfully and powerfully do we work. We recognize this principle in our expectation that the student shall come to college with a purpose, and our contempt for those who drift along from year to year with no other goal than graduation. We expect also that reasonable purposes shall guide in the selection of courses. It is not so clearly seen, however, that the same principle applies to details of study—to

reading the successive chapters of a book, listening to the progress of a lecture, or writing paragraphs in orderly sequence. Too often we do not know precisely what a writer or speaker is driving at, and do not greatly care. Much of our so-called study is haphazard; it consists in advancing from point to point without definite intention. We merely read or listen, waiting for something forcible to strike us.²

In the world of affairs, needless to say, men have to be more pointedly studious in their work. The problems of business, of legislation, of disease, require definite attack. Successful reporters do not wander after news; physicians study symptoms with reference to special diagnoses; lawyers must substantiate particular points of argument; manufacturers study the market for single commodities. Science likewise is guided by particular purposes of investigation. Everywhere the notable work of life is thoughtfully *aimed*.

A studious purpose is formed by thinking. It is not a heaven sent flash of inspiration, or a mechanical product of memory. It is the definite proposal of what one desires to do, the clear statement of what has been only a vague possibility. Such purposiveness is an art which depends upon training, upon practice. In college study, therefore, it is well to cultivate the habit of constantly keeping our aims in mind, noting the author's purpose and making it our own, grasping the lecturer's intention at the outset, and in our own speaking and writing deciding in advance what we want to say. Theses and examination papers would often be much more readable if the writer had done more clear thinking before beginning to write, and had taken the trouble to make a brief preparatory statement of the

²To illustrate this to a class I sometimes read aloud a paragraph from Bryce's chapter on American universities, with the request that the listeners note its expository purpose. But though the latter is expressed with sufficient clearness in the opening sentence, their statements differ widely and are in some cases far from the point. They catch striking phrases or sentences, but not their significance. The difficulty is simply lack of skill in purposiveness listening.

principal things which he wished to say. They would be less voluminous, perhaps, but much more scholarly.

Purposiveness not only helps us and others to understand; it increases the interest and pleasure of study, and lessens the weariness of the mental drudgery which is indispensable to scholarship. Our purposes carry us along by their momentum, and give an agreeable feeling of command. Incidentally they make trouble for competitors. Successful scholars are characterized by intelligent pertinacity in their aims; their thoughtfulness enables them to go directly to the mark, and on occasion to stick resolutely to a task when others become discouraged and abandon it. The intellectual labor of formulating a purpose clearly is no doubt hard—real thinking is the hardest kind of work—but in the long run it makes life easier and happier.³

Analysis and Note Taking

A subject of study usually has certain features which are of central importance, and which must be grasped by "analysis." A discussion of income taxation, for example, or a lecture about heredity, or a chapter on Plato's ethical theory contains some fundamental points which are, so to speak, the skeleton of the matter, and which are padded with expository material. Upon these points the student has to fix particular attention. The process is especially indispensable in courses which consist largely of lectures and supplementary reading. There is such a mass of

³There is, unfortunately, a kind of purposive study which deserves unqualified condemnation. It is that of sheer partisanship, the looking for arguments on only one side of a question, or aiming to find support for prejudices. There is no sharp line between impartial investigation of the truth and partisan effort to establish opinion, and the history of science shows curious illustrations of scholarship gone askew in this way.

A second qualification concerns the practice called "browsing," the relatively unpurposive tasting of a large variety of intellectual fodder. To one surrounded by libraries and reading rooms this is a constant temptation, and on the whole the practice is in good repute. It brings varied information, leads to the cultivation of new interests, and helps to form a genial, many sided character. It is commendable as a supplement but not as a substitute for real study.

information, and it is so hopeless a task to try to retain it all, that we have to make our mental burden as valuable as possible by summarizing, abstracting, and digesting, in the form of notes. Similarly a complex problem must be broken up into its subordinate parts, and these dealt with separately, before a total solution can be reached. Scholarship thus necessarily involves the reduction of extensive subjects to small compass for convenience of handling. Hence the need of an "analytic mind."

This ability is seldom a natural gift. Once in a while we find a student who naturally seizes upon the essential points of what he reads or hears and holds these for further use; but most of us muddle and flounder along in our study until we laboriously acquire the art. Though nature has provided us with the capability of developing it, we find that it comes mainly through patient cultivation. Text-books, in order to help the inept reader, often make use of italics, large type, marginal "side heads," and other devices to distinguish what is most significant; but in any case a good deal of analysis must be done by the reader, who digs out from a paragraph or page a single idea—its substantial thought. Lecturers likewise may present their subjects with analytic clearness—perhaps they ought to take special pains to do this—but none the less the student must learn to make his own analyses, and must learn to make them quickly and with precision.

A profound difficulty confronts us, however. How to perceive what is important, how to distinguish between this and what is merely interesting or rhetorically striking, is an art for which no specific rules can be given. It requires a sense of "idea values." Fortunately almost every one possesses this sense in an elementary form, so that the problem becomes that of discovering how to develop it into expert skill. And here we may note two good practical rules. The first is that as a preliminary step to analysis we do well to get a comprehensive view of the whole. A quick survey of a mathematical demonstration, a rapid reading of a chapter, a glance at the general course of an argument, facilitates the subsequent analytic

examination. Such a "bird's-eye view" is inadequate in itself—too many students content themselves with this and no more!—but it is a genuine step in learning. The preliminary view of the whole helps to locate the details in their proper places. And the second rule is that we should ask ourselves at the conclusion of a chapter or in review of a lecture, What are the main ideas which the writer; or speaker, has expressed? What does his discussion amount to, "boiled down"? To ask and answer such questions, to practice summarization of what we read or hear, is to gain analytic power.

Much of our analysis takes the form of written notes. Some students, it is true, are disinclined to do this; they dislike the interruption to listening or reading, and think it wiser to pay continuous attention, trusting the unaided memory to retain the substance of what is said. In general this seems to me unwise. Probably most of us pay better attention when we compel ourselves to make written notes. It is difficult, too, by mere listening to fix new ideas in our minds so that we do not need the subsequent clarification which notes provide. I have more than once observed that those who dispensed with writing showed, under examination, very inadequate command of the material which they supposed themselves to have grasped. Both the act of recording the notes and the use of them in review are essential to study.

Note taking may be overdone, however. Some methodical persons habitually carry notebooks or blank cards, and scarcely read anything of a serious nature without jotting down its point. The result is a kind of reference library of notes, systematically filed, and occasionally very useful. Such patient labor is exceptional, and for the most part unnecessary. It is better to take few rather than many notes, and to use these few as pegs on which to hang our own further reflections. We learn most by thinking things over. At the same time the habit of recording an especially important thought, wherever we meet it, is well worth while.⁴

⁴In reading books of our own we may underline important

Gradually the student gains the faculty of grasping a point instantly and firmly, then hastening along, even skipping with only a passing glance over much "connective tissue" until he strikes something vital again. The amount that trained readers compass in a single hour is astonishing. Their skill has reached such perfection that the eye automatically takes in a page, fixes upon its central thought, and swiftly passes on to the next. Editors and literary critics habitually read dozens of volumes and scores of current magazines in a small fraction of the time which we would require, yet thoroughly enough to extract their substance. The strange feature of the process is the disregard of unimportant matter without exactly looking to see whether it is unimportant. This is highly trained analytic attention.

The student therefore needs to cultivate concurrently two kinds of analytic skill, that of reading a book, perhaps a textbook, closely, carefully, thoughtfully, and also that of reading rapidly a large quantity of material for the sake of its principal ideas.

The most striking accomplishments of analytic thought are found in the scientific observation and explanation of facts. In natural science we are dealing, not primarily with books and lectures—material which is itself the product of analysis, and is arranged to facilitate study—but with a chaotic field in which the discrimination of the relevant from the irrelevant, and the reduction of the matter to its simplest terms are very much more difficult. How helpless we are in trying to study ourselves out of a difficulty with an erratic typewriter or a misbehaving furnace—puzzles much less obscure than the secrets of nature. Perhaps it is not to be expected that the rank and file of college students shall do much more than repeat experiments and come to an understanding of what others have discovered. Yet now and then there appears a sentences, or indicate them by a marginal mark, or we may write in the margin a brief statement which summarizes a paragraph. This obviously helps us in review. But in the name of academic decency let us refrain from marking books which belong to other persons or to a library. We might with as much propriety carve our names on a neighbor's front door.

first hand observer, gifted with the power of analytic attention to nature, and the result is a Newcomb, a Shaler, a James, and a little pushing forward of the frontier of our knowledge into the wilderness of our ignorance.

Supplementary Thinking

Study we have seen to consist of purposive thinking and analytic thinking. It also consists of supplementary thinking,—the enlargement, clarification and correction of what is presented to us. For example, the editorial on "Smoking in Street Cars," which I have just read, has less value for me as an authoritative statement which I need to learn than as a means of developing my own opinion. It brings to mind my own observations, it raises questions about habits and tendencies of human nature and about health and comfort, it invites criticism, partial acceptance and partial rejection. And so if I spend some minutes in supplementary thought on the subject I understand it better than I would by simply perusing the editor's remarks. Books, magazine articles, sermons and lectures are often chiefly valuable not as information but as food for reflection. In this subject the best presentation of the various features of college life which I can make is certainly inadequate and hence is to be used by the student, through his own reflection, to develop a more correct and comprehensive view.

Some of the principal forms of supplementary thought are the following:

First, Illustration. Facts and principles are rendered much clearer if we can throw upon them the light of similar matters with which we are familiar. Thus our understanding of an idiom in a foreign language is facilitated by comparing it with an odd usage of English. If a new project of legislation is mentioned, a reflective listener can perhaps tell how it has worked in his own state. Some students are especially bright in illustrating history by modern analogies, or the principles of economics or ethics by observations of contemporary American affairs. New ideas mean something to them in terms of their own experience, and whatever they touch glows with a warmth

that comes from contact with life. The thoughtful search for fresh illustrations gives us a better grasp of what we are trying to illustrate.

Second, Explanation. We "explain" when we ascertain the cause of a fact, or relate a specific truth to one of more general application. Human beings have a spontaneous interest in the *why* of things, an interest exhibited even by children in their curious questions about the world and what happens around them. This interest needs only cultivation to become the dynamic of scientific progress, for science consists of observing nature so carefully that we can formulate its laws, which we then use to explain particular occurrences and to predict the future. The physical sciences are already well developed in this respect, but the complex behavior of society is little understood in terms of cause and effect. We have yet to learn definitely how political crises, labor movements and religious developments show the working of great natural laws. The cause of a recent financial flurry, for example, is stated in the newspapers with profuse variety and with little agreement as to the relative importance of the factors involved. Our studies in all fields are continually presenting facts which call for explanation, and if we attack them with this kind of "supplementary thinking" we may contribute a little to the advance of learning as well as increase our rational power. So important, indeed, is the explanatory point of view that some of our leading educators have regarded the development of it as the central feature of an ideal educational system.

Third, Evaluation. This is the process of estimating the worth of an idea, of looking at both sides of a question, weighing the evidence and forming a just conclusion. In advanced study as in matters of everyday experience facts often seem at variance and opinions about them differ, so that it is the task of the student to ascertain the real truth for himself. Instead of accepting uncritically whatever strikes him as plausible, or rejecting the views of others because they do not harmonize with his prejudices, he can put himself in the position of a judge who decides a case on its merits. This balancing of considerations to deter-

mine their relative value, in other words the "judicial" habit of mind, is in some persons a natural gift, but we can all cultivate it.⁵

A special responsibility for evaluative thinking rests upon the college bred. Contemporary problems, such as arise in the fields of education, government, and religion, call for wise, independent judgment on the part of those who deal with them. Conservatism and radicalism alike need intelligent criticism. Guidance by tradition and authority are perhaps best for the mass of people, but such guidance often fails in dealing with new conditions; while on the other hand the zeal of new ideas and the emotions of sympathy and anger in matters of reform must be tempered by sound discrimination. College graduates ought to be leaders of public opinion, and at the same time the steady balance wheel of society. To see all sides of a question, to remain unaffected by prejudice, to act for the welfare of the town, the city, the state and the nation, rather than for that of a particular class, is their special privilege. College is the place where fairmindedness may be most thoroughly acquired. The best kind of training may be obtained through the deliberate and impartial discussion of the controversial questions of college study and college life.⁶

⁵I once found almost an entire class answering the question, Why is play more attractive than study? by saying simply that the goal of study is more distant than that of play. Probably they had obtained this explanation, which is a part of the truth, from some seemingly authoritative source, but it is significant that few had reflected upon the point enough to observe that study often has a goal as immediate as that of play, that some persons find study more attractive than play, that play appeals to social and competitive instincts much more than study. Yet all these considerations lie within easy reach of one who thinks the matter over.

⁶There is a kind of hypertrophied thoughtfulness which ends in inactivity or in scepticism. One may see all sides of a problem so meditatively as to disable himself from doing anything about it;—perhaps this is a special danger to the student because he is removed from active participation in the world's affairs. But on the whole thoughtfulness tends to efficiency.

CHAPTER XI

SCHOLARSHIP

Are College Students Unscholarly?

If the teachers in American colleges were asked to state what in their opinion is the principal defect in student life, they would probably answer in chorus, "Lack of scholarship!" Friendly, likable, courteous, morally earnest though the student may be, possessed of excellent qualities and full of promise for the future, he yet fails as a rule in one important respect—the desire to master a subject of study, and the willingness to sacrifice other interests for this end. Belonging to an institution which is essentially devoted, as its history clearly shows, to the highest culture of the mind, he takes part in it and even helps to carry on its daily life without fully realizing its meaning. Lacking, it is alleged, is "the spirit of learning."

Is this charge true? Certainly not in an unqualified form. There are genuine scholars in the ranks of student life, young men and young women of brilliancy and power who leave nothing to be desired in the way of scholarly thoughtfulness and zeal. Perhaps there are more of these than the professorial critic ordinarily acknowledges, for while he appreciates the good work which comes before him, he is obliged to spend most of his time in considering another kind, and he not infrequently finds himself overwhelmed by the mass of good natured indifference to study. The intellectually earnest are crowded into the background of the scene.

But when this qualification is made the fact remains that most college work is mediocre. It passes, but does not do justice to the subject or the capability of the student. The latter gives only intermittent attention to lecture or

discussion, scans hastily one or two references when a dozen are important, contents himself with a cursory perusal of a chapter instead of a thoughtful analysis of it, passes over points of difficulty without examination. Slipshod, inaccurate recitation; vague, unsystematic essays; incoherent, superficial reports of reading; "fuzzy" ideas appropriately expressed in careless grammar or illegible script—these are prevalent facts. Undoubtedly the easy going student acquires some information, but his attainment is frequently sufficient only to pass very lenient requirements. How far his performance is from genuine scholarship he himself knows. Confronted with the question, "How much of your work have you done as well as you can?" he would probably answer conscientiously, "Not much."¹

Probably the undergraduate would be moved to remark further that the innumerable demands of college life make scholarship impossible; and certainly the reasons for the present condition are easily seen. In the first place there is a lack of initial interest, especially in required but seemingly futile subjects; and this untoward state of mind is hampered by a lack of methodical knowledge of how to study. Undoubtedly many students enter college without constitutional fitness, clear purpose, or proper disciplinary training. The ease with which a college education may be attained attracts many who have little natural capacity for it, and little desire to excel in it. The difficulty is increased by the social complexity of college life with its emphasis upon athletic, fraternal and other non-intellectual activities. These are naturally more interesting, on account of their social character, than are subjects of study. Scholarship suffers because it is so individualistic a pursuit; it wins no great social approval because it lacks social enthusiasm. Hence social incentives to it are wanting, and the ideal college man is defined in other terms than intel-

¹ An interesting contrast is pointed out between these conditions and those which prevail in Oxford and Cambridge. The general level of scholarship is perhaps not widely different in the two cases, but in our colleges fewer students give themselves to study with the utmost earnestness, and become known as scholars of the first rank.

lectual proficiency. Furthermore, the lure of professional ambition is felt less keenly than in the professional school. A liberal education does not obviously point toward success, in the common understanding of the term; it shows little direct connection with the business and enjoyment of life. The total result is that a large majority are content with mediocre work, and the college is distinguished by faculty learnedness rather than by undergraduate learning.²

What is the remedy for a condition so manifestly inappropriate in an institution of higher learning? Our answer must recognize that no single prescription is adequate. The problem must be attacked from different sides, and improvement must come through the combined force of various influences.

The Motives of Scholarship

Let us understand at the outset that scholarship necessarily involves cooperation. Instructors cannot communicate it to unwilling students, and on the other hand the scholarly minded student needs direction by the instructor. As we touch the matter on different sides we find at every point that teachers can supply the motives of scholarship only if "the party of the second part" gives them a lodgment in his own thought.

First, of course, there must be interest in the subject, the perception that it represents some aspect of human life and that knowledge of it reacts upon life, giving the latter breadth, dignity and power. This "life value" may be explained, but generally speaking it will be realized by the student only through deliberately, voluntarily taking an interest. Second, successful scholarship depends upon knowledge of method. Indifference sometimes comes from vagueness as to just what is to be done or just how to do it. The art of study varies, of course, in different

² Mr. Dooley depicts the incoming freshman as welcomed by the president with the inquiry, "Me dear boy, what special branch iv larnin wud ye like to have studied fr ye be our competint professors?" and the good-humored gibe indicates a fact. The division of labor is often accepted by teachers as well as by students.

subjects, and like other arts can be learned only by specific instruction and responsive practice. Perhaps teachers ought to inculcate precise methods more carefully than they ordinarily do, showing how to take notes, how to look for material, how to limit and define topics, how to use apparatus, and the like. Possibly the student also ought to take more pains to learn just how work should be done. And this leads us to a third point: the solid basis of scholarship is the regular practice of meeting definite requirements. As we learn by actually *doing*, so the worth as well as the art of scholarly effort reveals itself to those who become accustomed to steady performance. How many students not only have no regular study habits, but also have a feeling that probably none are needed, since nothing definite is really required! Accordingly, there is a basic need of a fair amount of regular work. If the minimum valleys and average levels of study can be raised in this way perhaps the higher peaks will rise spontaneously.

These are positive prerequisites. A negative one, frequently proposed, is the stricter regulation of the affairs of college life which distract attention from study. It seems absurd to allow these to absorb so much time and energy that the student has little or none left for his main business, hence many critics think that there is need of rigorous surgical treatment of these excrescences, and some colleges limit the number of college enterprises in which a student may engage. It may be doubted, however, whether such restrictions have much positive effect in improving scholarship; but apart from this consideration it is questionable whether the limitation of individual freedom, except for the direct benefit of the college as a social body, is desirable. Certainly it is better if possible to encourage scholarship by showing that it is worth while.

In order to make this clear it has been proposed that the number and value of honors and prizes be increased. Competition will thus be stimulated, it is hoped, and the winners will attain such honor as is now accorded almost exclusively to athletes. Doubtless it would be possible in this way to encourage scholarly effort, but we may question whether the method goes to the root of the difficulty or

would have extensive effect. There is comparatively little competition for existing prizes, even when they are of considerable value. The four principal kinds of scholarly distinction—paid or honorary scholarships, special honors in particular courses or departments, essay and debating prizes, and membership in the honorary societies of Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi—do not commonly attract a large number of competitors. They call for individualistic rather than for social effort, and perhaps for this reason are often regarded with mild contempt as the concern of an abnormal, unsocial type of mind. The honor loses importance if it fails to command social appreciation. Furthermore, money awards seem so uncertain of attainment that the practical mind looks upon competition for them as a probable waste of time. To preach that the effort is well worth while in itself is to make use of the very considerations which such a mind does not grasp—the intrinsic dignity of scholarship and its general utility as training.

The depreciation of scholarship will therefore not be radically altered by increasing the number of honors and prizes. While these have a wholesome function in college, and perhaps more are needed, they fail to solve the problem of increasing respect for study. If the common undergraduate valuation of intellectual proficiency is inadequate, this mistake can be corrected only by showing that such proficiency leads to certain things in life which are unmistakably desirable—to successful professional work, to refined enjoyment, to effective citizenship.

The solution of the problem therefore lies in the direction of proving that scholarship brings rewards in life which the unscholarly do not attain. Can this be proved? Certainly a considerable amount of evidence is found in the fact that the students who win the highest grades in college study also win an exceedingly disproportionate number of distinctions in later life. This important truth is revealed by comparing college records with those of the professional school, with the testimony of *Who's Who*, and with the careful observations of college authorities who follow the careers of college graduates. Such comparison

of student performance with subsequent achievement shows that the college scholar has much the best chance of distinguishing himself in law, medicine, and other highly trained vocations, as well as of attaining more general kinds of influence and happiness.³ Undoubtedly success in life finds its explanation in other conditions and qualities of character beside zeal in study—in friendliness, in influential support, and in sheer will. The kind of success which is desirable is based on an “all ’round” excellence of character. But we ought not to entertain the delusion that this broad excellence may omit studious interest, or that the hard student is doomed to obscurity. In view of the facts the notion that study does not pay can hardly be sustained. Study most distinctly does pay. Probably it does not bring the very largest pecuniary rewards, but there is unmistakable evidence that it brings success in the soundest and best meaning of the term.

Grades

Consideration of the problem of scholarship inevitably runs into the subject of grades, i.e., the letters, words or numbers which officially indicate degrees of scholarly excellence. Almost every one is keenly interested in these symbols. He may be ambitious or hopeless, proud or ashamed, gratified or disgruntled, but he is rarely indifferent. In fact it may be said that nine-tenths of the problem of scholarship as felt by college students is that of securing satisfactory grades. These are so important an appendage of the curriculum, and their advantages and disadvantages

³For example, the percentage of Phi Beta Kappa graduates who achieve later distinction is approximately three times that of all college graduates who do this. For a discussion of the subject and a report of statistical studies see Foster, *Administration of the College Curriculum*, Ch. XI. Compare also Slosson, *Great American Universities*, pp. 68, 69.

Our conclusion is not invalidated by the fact that there are geniuses who do not fit into the college scheme, who fail in its studies, and who nevertheless accomplish great things in later life by methods of their own. These peculiar exceptions, properly understood, rather reenforce the general truth. Nor is it significant that the mere “grind” is likely to get nowhere. The spirit of scholarship must of course be integrated in a well rounded life.

are so complex, that it is worth our while to consider the matter somewhat in detail. Are they a desirable asset or an intolerable nuisance? What is the proper attitude toward them?⁴

As an advantage we must acknowledge their administrative usefulness. They not only define the passing mark, but they help to give definiteness to conditions of graduation. They are a basis for awarding honors, and for recommending graduates for various appointments. In short they constitute a more reliable record of what a student has done, and a more exact measure of his intellectual ability, than could be stated conveniently in any other way. Secondly, their influence as incentives, though this is commonly overestimated, is unquestionably effective in the case of some individuals. To a few at the top of the ladder the A is a tempting bait, steadily pursued week after week when without it work would have slackened; while at the other end of the scale the mark of failure is a goad which prods the delinquent with its pointed suggestion of disgrace. To a smaller extent intermediate grades have a similar effect. They help to settle the practical problem of how hard to work. And apart from this consideration they satisfy a natural human curiosity, the desire to know how well one is doing in a field which is too extensive or complex for one's own grasp. The grade is the instructor's relatively expert estimate of one's knowledge and power, matters in which one is justifiably interested.

On the other hand it may be urged that grades distract attention from the central purpose of study; that they

*Grades appear to have been used originally to determine relative standing in the award of final honors; but in time they gained new functions as conditions of graduation and as a basis for expelling poor students. The use of them is now all but universal, though a few institutions dispense with them, except for the necessary distinction between passing and failure, and some do not report them to students. There is a general tendency toward the adoption of a simple system consisting of four passing grades, A, B, C, D, and two grades, E and F, indicating more or less complete failure. This system has a workable simplicity, and facilitates the transfer of a student from one institution to another.

tend to make one aim at a letter rather than at a grasp of the subject. At best this is not the ideal "spirit of learning"; at worst it produces a "grade hunting" character, inquisitive, envious, petulant, even dishonest in large or petty ways. Occasionally it leads to overwork and ill health, especially among girls, who sometimes regard the letter A as a symbol of salvation. But the principle objection is that it imposes a narrow, artificial and unreliable standard of accomplishment in place of the student's own deliberate judgment of what his study amounts to. The standard is unsatisfactory because it is based on a few answers to questions, or pages of writing, conveniently assumed to represent the student's total grasp of a subject. How far from the truth this may be, especially in the case of a "catchy" examination, or how inadequately the grade may indicate the student's intellectual upbuilding, we need not stop to explain. Moreover the grade is only the judgment of a single person, sometimes one of rather unjudicial character. Instructors mark very variously. The same paper, submitted to Mr. X and to Mr. Y, will be highly commended by one and called a poor effort by the other. The judgment of the instructor varies at different times, and as a rule is too lenient at all times. Almost every one gives a larger percentage of high grades than is reasonable, and some are habitually thus indulgent to a third or a half of the class. Under such conditions mediocre students who fail to receive the highest mark feel disappointed, and distinctions of honor cease to be distinctive. More rarely the teacher shows a discouraging unwillingness to recognize real ability, or bases his marking, consciously or unconsciously, upon the student's general reputation for scholarship. No doubt instructors are usually fair minded and conscientious. Serious injustice is infrequent. But when one has to read scores of essays or examination papers in a few hours, critical analysis is impossible, and appreciation is necessarily somewhat impressionistic. The overburdened reader looks hastily for certain main points, makes a shrewd estimate of the writer's knowledge and labor, and passes on to the next paper.

There are two principles which should govern the assign-

ment of grades, and in consequence the student's understanding of the matter. The first is that the pass mark ought to indicate satisfactory work. Too often it is given grudgingly, and with a strong flavor of condemnation, to those whose work clearly does not deserve it. The land is full of college graduates who have "passed" in subjects about which they know almost nothing. But what, as a question of intellectual consistency, does "passing" mean if not a genuine grasp of a subject? The view that the C has a shadow of disgrace athwart it is quite as unjustifiable as the student's acceptance of it as "the gentleman's grade." If one passes in a course no special praise or criticism is appropriate; he has satisfied the minimum requirements—which should be high enough to make his performance really satisfactory. If he displays greater ability or energy, and especially if his instincts of scholarship lead him to put individuality and originality into his work, he should receive credit in the form of higher grades. The highest should be reserved for extraordinarily brilliant accomplishment. With this understanding the D may be assigned to the relatively few doubtful cases, the merits of which cannot easily be determined more precisely.

The second principle is that mental ability varies according to a kind of natural law, so that the different grades normally go to certain proportions of the class. Under proper conditions of instruction there are a few who deserve the highest mark on account of extraordinary brilliancy or zeal. At the other extreme there are a few failures and cases of doubt. The rest of the class is of average merit, though it may be subdivided into smaller grade-groups. Thus, to state the principle in convenient figures, we may say that ten per cent of a class should receive A, twenty-five per cent B, fifty per cent C, and fifteen per cent D, E and F. In so far as the class is a selected group these proportions may vary. In a small number class of advanced students there may be an abnormal amount of excellent ability; while in a very large class the difficulty of holding individuals to their work may ultimately produce an over weight of low grades. Required and elective courses are likely to show a slight

difference, and any course will now and then gather an exceptional number of hard workers or of dullards. But as a rule a class will naturally fall into groups of some such proportions as those stated.⁵

The application of these principles will perhaps be unwelcome to one who has been accustomed to getting high marks easily, and they may bring an unpleasant feeling of being predestined to a place in the lower half of the class, or a discouraging sense of being only an average student. But on the whole it is better to get just what we deserve, and in the long run it is more satisfactory to know where we stand than to harbor illusions about our ability—and suffer inevitable disillusionment later. Unsuccessful in one field, possibly we will attain success in another.

What is most needed is a lessened interest in grades and an increased interest in the subjects studied. Concern about grades is, after all, rather childish. Much of it is mere curiosity, or pride, or a somewhat selfish spirit of competition,—traits which are not of the first importance in human character. Graduate students and those who have a strong professional purpose become indifferent to marks, and relish the freer atmosphere of advanced study. Some undergraduates, likewise, rise above such petty considerations. They have a more stimulating objective, and also a more critical judgment about their own work. The true scholar cares for the instructor's help rather than for a grade, and cares most for what he feels himself to be obtaining from his work. He knows that his own thoughtful judgment on this point is more important than that of any one else. Is it not possible to develop more widely the spirit of scholarship which strives for what is really worth while, and declines to trouble itself with mere letters or figures? Acknowledging that human nature has an instinctive desire for such distinctions, from which it seldom

⁵The ground for this assertion lies in certain psychological experiments, and in the careful observation of mental ability in large numbers of persons. Tests susceptible of exact measurement reveal in statistical form the natural law of distribution of mental ability. For an extended discussion of the subject see Foster, *Administration of the College Curriculum*, Chap. XIII.

becomes completely free, we may still hold that other motives should dominate college study. The distinction which most college students need is the trained mind which has methodical command of a problem, and an independent, self critical power of investigation. One who possesses this is not likely to lack the more formal distinctions.

CHAPTER XII

STUDENT HONESTY

Prevalent Conditions

In college as elsewhere we find honest and dishonest persons. Some students are simply incorruptible; no matter what emergencies arise they present for credit no work which is not entirely their own. A few, on the other hand, are habitually dishonest, willing to make use of any illegal resources if they can do so with probable safety, wholly callous to the dishonor and injustice of their action. Fortunately they are very few. Between extremes are those who are more or less likely to succumb to temptation, and it is this large middle class, the occasionally or accidentally dishonest, of which we need to take special account. They are not naturally or deliberately immoral, but are rather weak or thoughtless about the matter.

The principal causes of stumbling are found in the pressure of difficult and disagreeable tasks, laziness, personal antagonism to an instructor, and the persistence of an immature attitude toward study, a view of it as irksome discipline rather than a means of growth. At the moment, perhaps, the offence seems a peccadillo, justified by overpowering necessity and by human nature in general. But of course it may be the first stroke in wearing a groove of habit. The next slip is easier.

College dishonesty is usually more or less localized in particular subjects or courses. Exacting, uninteresting requirements in mathematics or English composition, for example, produce traditions which are passed along from one class to another, to the effect that certain slippery methods have become legitimate through common use. Recitations or examinations which impose undue strain

upon the memory encourage the practices of reading from concealed translations, borrowing surreptitious assistance from friendly neighbors, and carrying into the chamber of torture illicit information in compact and inconspicuous form. Doubtless the most common evil is the submission of written work, such as themes and essays, which have been copied from books, or perhaps begged, borrowed, purchased or stolen from more gifted associates. There is so much writing in college courses that shrewd scamps now and then make a lucrative business of supplying theses and other material to those who, in the polished language of the advertisement, "have no taste, time or aptitude for such tasks." Fraternities sometimes preserve the written work of members for use by later generations. Kindred spirits in the pursuit, or rather the avoidance of unpleasant studies ingeniously organize an "intelligence bureau" which places the slight learning of each at the disposal of all. Such localized dishonesty does not necessarily extend its operation to other courses of study, but it is likely to do so in emergencies.

College dishonesty is illogical, however. So complex and irrational is moral character that a student who will cheat roundly under some circumstances will be scrupulously honest under others not essentially different. Moreover, some who hardly hesitate to look on a neighbor's paper will refrain from lying if detected, perhaps because in their childhood training they received a deep and lasting impression that spoken falsehood is wrong, whereas scholastic honor was a later and more superficial acquisition. Furthermore, one who will deceive an instructor may be a pinnacle of rectitude in other respects—generous, loyal, active for the welfare of the college. Once in a while a prominent and respected student is caught in deception, to the amazement of everybody. On the other hand a punctiliously honest fellow may be a prig and a social nuisance. It should be added, however, that habitual dishonesty in study is generally significant of moral weakness in other directions. The tendency of any unsound spot in the fabric of one's character is sooner or later to corrupt the whole, while conversely a habit of

honesty works to harmonize the rest of life with itself. From one point of view, indeed, the function of the college is precisely that of introducing rational and moral consistency into life.

College study, like the business of the country at large, is in general conducted honestly; in both fields dishonesty is exceptional. While there are occasional lapses on the part of individuals, and some slight epidemics, college students as a class meet fair requirements with honest effort. There is no reason to believe that dishonesty is more prevalent to-day than it was fifty years ago, when the "trot" was not unknown in college halls, though doubtless it has evolved in variety along with the curriculum. The evil diminishes, too, as the student advances; upper classes are comparatively free from it. What exists is of relatively small proportions, and demands attention just as an epidemic of disease, affecting only a fraction of one per cent of the population, calls for preventive and curative treatment. The problem is partly that of removing certain unhealthy conditions, and partly the development of an intelligent view of student responsibility. Reasonable requirements and fair examinations will do much to lessen the evil, a concerted "college spirit" of honesty is requisite, and the significance of dishonesty with regard to character and life work needs to be made clear.

The Honor System

The most notable line of improvement is that of the "honor system," which transfers responsibility for the honest performance of work from the instructor to the student himself, on the theory that trust encourages honesty, whereas supervision fails to secure it. The name is applied to three forms of practice. Sometimes it indicates only a general habit of trust, according to which students are left alone in examinations. Sometimes it includes a written declaration that the student has neither given nor received improper aid. Lastly, it may imply responsibility on the part of every one to report any offence which he sees, either to the faculty or to a student

committee which is empowered to deal with the case. In one or another of these forms it is found in about a third of American colleges, and the adoption of it is increasing. On the whole it appears to work successfully, though opinions concerning its efficacy vary, and there have been occasional failures and abandonment.¹

A frequent objection to the honor system is that it is artificial in comparison with the conditions of every day life. We do not ordinarily have our word taken unquestionably; rather do we expect to purchase tickets, give receipts, present witnesses, and altogether to stand a great deal of scrutiny. Similarly in college, it is said, we ought to look upon supervision simply as a sound method of ascertaining that work is properly done. Reliance upon honor in particular matters or under special conditions tends to suggest that at other times deception is normal if not proper. The higher kind of honor, we are told, the honor that is perfectly indifferent to supervision or the lack of it, remains undeveloped.

The force of this objection is overbalanced in the opinion of many, however, by the practical effectiveness of the honor system as contrasted with supervision. Possibly, too, the discrepancy from ordinary life is less than is alleged; trust and confidence are after all rather common. Thus we customarily accept one another's word without question, especially in the friendly, family and even in the business relations to which the college bears closest analogy, unless there is reason for demanding better credentials. The danger that trust will tend to cultivate a state of mind which is not honest unless it is trusted is largely fanciful, and is certainly overborne by the value of forming a habit of working honestly. The graduates of honor system colleges are probably not less honest in affairs of later life than are the graduates of others. The practical effects of the system, both in college and afterward, are, in the opinion of a majority of students and instructors who have had experience with it, such as to justify confi-

¹ For the results of questionnaire investigations see Sheldon, *Student Life and Customs*, pp. 262-265, and *The Nation*, May 2, 1912, Letter on the Honor System.

dence in it. It actually helps to create conditions and to form habits of honesty.

Each of the three forms of the honor system has its merits and its difficulties or defects. The simple relation of mutual confidence between instructors and students is in itself a desirable condition, and it is one which often works satisfactorily without more methodical reenforcement. Single courses and even whole departments are found in which no one thinks of cheating or being cheated, no matter what occurs elsewhere. This is especially true of mature students, engaged in study of their own choosing, and enjoying relations of personal friendship with their teachers. In such cases the clear atmosphere of habitual honesty pervading the departmental precincts may be a refreshing and inspiring change to newcomers. No better method of cultivating self dependence and respect for work could be found. There is plenty of testimony that it stiffens the student's self reliance, accentuates the meanness of cheating, and is seldom abused even by persons who have been accustomed to dishonesty elsewhere.

Occasional abuse there will surely be, however. Students are human beings, and human nature is inclined to take care of itself in emergencies as best it can. But certainly there is no more dishonesty under a judicious exercise of trust than regularly occurs under conditions of suspicion, and the total result in the development of character is far more wholesome. It is better to provide an opportunity for moral self development, even though a few prove unworthy, than it is to continue through the college years a state of mind characteristic of immaturity and foreign to the spirit of higher education. Freedom, as we have already noted, implies the possibility of abuse, and the possibility of doing right involves the danger of doing wrong. Instructors are now and then saddened by such abuse of confidence, but this regret is overbalanced by the concurrent opinion of a multitude of students as to the efficacy and value of trust in their own lives.

The reason for requiring a written pledge of adherence to the honor system is that it serves as a concrete reminder of responsibility,—a thing which is perhaps espe-

cially needful in large colleges with their loose personal ties between faculty and student body. If the institution professes to maintain the principle of honor in its examinations it is well to have this asserted by individuals as a matter of their own adoption. It also acts as a deterrent in the case of one who would cheat but who would not lie about it, for these offences, as has been pointed out, are not equally easy to commit. On the other hand it encourages the offender to add one fault to another, and it fails to reach those who are hardened in dishonesty.

The honor system in its third form rests upon the assumption that when dishonesty occurs students have not only knowledge of the fact, but also moral reliability in dealing with it. This assumption is of crucial importance. It is one thing to possess a sense of responsibility with regard to one's own conduct; it is quite another to acknowledge responsibility for the conduct of others. So in society at large, one who would pilfer an apple from a fruit stand, or beat his way on a street car, is usually unwilling to report or rebuke those whom he chances to observe committing these misdemeanors. Not unless the offense is criminally dangerous do we feel under obligation to bring the offender to justice. In college, likewise, reporting dishonestly seems to be tale bearing, and even to show disloyalty. Perfectly honorable students have an instinctive repugnance to doing such a thing, and colleges have sometimes refused to adopt the honor system simply because they would not tolerate what they regarded as dishonorable spying.² Other colleges have abandoned it because in this respect it failed; when cheating occurred no one would give information to the authorities.

Such reluctance cannot be overcome except by some more powerful sentiment. Accordingly the success of the honor system in this form is dependent upon a point of view

² Opponents of this method sometimes object to it on the ground that it turns students into detectives or spies. This, of course, is not true. No one is properly supposed to look about for dishonesty. Responsibility implies only that if one happens to observe an offence he shall help to maintain the honor system by reporting it.

which regards dishonesty as a serious offense, particularly in the light of "college spirit." Otherwise cribbing seems only a peccadillo, or not the observer's business. Strong loyalty to the welfare of the college is the only motive which is strong enough to overcome revulsion against tale bearing. Needless to say, this type of college spirit is rare. It signifies participation in the historic ideals of the institution, and it reflects itself in the character of the individual student, making him first and foremost a member of the college body. Huge metropolitan colleges, with their inner diversity of interests are less favorable for the development of it than are colleges of a more isolated and homogeneous sort. It requires a strong traditional group consciousness, actively militant against every one who flouts its customs. The mere voting for it, even unanimously, is far from assuring it of success as more than one college has discovered. It needs not only good intentions, or even college spirit in the usual meaning of the term, but rather an unusual absorption of the individual in the life and ideals of the college, so that the interests of the latter become paramount. Without this there may be much college honor, but not a thorough going "honor system."

Practical Considerations

Since dishonesty "is the thing that it is," the correction of it is somebody's business, and this means the business of those who know about it and can correct it most effectively. In so far as the evil arises from unjust requirements by an instructor it is appropriate to explain the matter frankly to him. If his methods are such as to encourage cheating, or his exactions so unfair as to constitute temptation, the class can make this clear. He may not acquiesce, but he is likely to change his practices, if not his mind. If he does not, it is justifiable and even desirable to bring the matter to the attention of the administration. Publicity is the most wholesome corrective of injustice.

But this advocacy of democratic principles implies some-

thing else which may be less agreeable. If a student is known to be dishonest, and especially if he abuses the privileges of a course and the confidence of an instructor, it is the duty of his associates to deal with him. It is usually quite possible to do this gently and effectively. I have more than once known a single student to correct an erring neighbor in a kindly way, and I think that this is the best method if it can be brought to bear upon the case. If no one is willing to undertake it alone, perhaps a little group of three or four, whose motives and standing are unimpeachable, would better act together, showing the offender that he is disregarding the welfare of the college in a particularly foolish and futile way. The difficulty of starting such a concerted movement is obvious, but the willingness to do this is real college spirit, and the group method may overcome individual reluctance. In any case this is certain: college students ought not to treat a cribber as though his offense were nothing. If he is dishonoring the college he deserves at least coldness and neglect. Ostracism is a most effective punishment.

In making the matter clear to one who needs enlightenment it is hardly worth while to dilate on the wrongness of cheating. Every one understands that dishonesty is wrong. To dwell upon the enormity of the offence is likely to provoke a reaction, as against exaggerated moralism. But there are certain truths which may need to be explained. The first is that the common forms of dishonesty are not of much use. The little aid thus obtained is unlikely to affect very greatly the total estimate of one's work; or in other words one must cheat in a rather extensive way in order to profit by it. As a matter of cold fact it is generally true that the cribber either could have passed without his cribbing, or has failed with it. At the moment the need of help looms large, but the emergency is probably much less significant than it seems, and if the stress of temptation would permit one to ask himself "Is this going to be really worth while?" and to think it over, his own answer in most cases would be a resolute "No."

Second, the danger of detection, or at least of incurring suspicion, is much greater than is commonly supposed. Some forms of dishonesty can be practiced shrewdly without much liability of exposure, for college teachers are not detectives, and often prefer not to investigate a suspicious case unless the evidence is strong. But irregular acts almost inevitably arouse suspicion. The culprit draws attention to himself by disturbed look or stealthy gesture, by unaccustomed glibness or unfamiliar phrase. As a rule, if a theme or examination paper contains much stolen material its face bewrayeth it, just as extraordinary fluency in translation reveals the "pony." And suspicion sticks to one's reputation like pitch to one's fingers. Any instructor will testify that there are certain persons whom he cannot recall without the flitting of a shadow across his memory. The evidence was inconclusive, but the suspicion remains. Years afterward such a recollection may attach itself to one's life like a burr which refuses to be shaken off, and some new accusation may gain plausibility on account of it. It is plainly, literally and most emphatically true that we cannot afford to act suspiciously. A doubtful reputation is a severe penalty in itself.

Where detection follows, the consequences are all the more serious. I have known a record of dishonesty to pursue a man for years, through three institutions, thousands of miles apart, and into his professional life. The practice of requiring students who come from other colleges to present a certificate of good character obviously increases the danger. No one can outlive conviction. Every college has upon its list of former students the names of some who never return to its campus and its festivals, and who would be scorned by their former associates if they did.

The most painful penalty is the self condemnation which is likely to come later. The unpleasant memory darkens self respect like an indelible stain. There is no forgetting. The only escape is a larger corruption of character to correspond with the offence.

Hence a fundamental need in this matter is that we should be honest with ourselves. While college honesty

is a social matter, and while any honor system must derive its force in large measure from group interests, it remains true that our own judgment of what is right and wrong is of final authority for us, and that our main responsibility is to our own intellectual conscience. If we know that common customs are dishonest, and that common excuses are sophistries, let us treat them as such. A college education ought to enable us to distinguish between a genuine reason and a pretence which masquerades as one. To form our ideals and habits deliberately, to face tasks resolutely, to grasp and hold fast the truth that higher education does not consist in learning or avoiding lessons for teachers, but in self development, this is the educational point of view which solves the problem of honesty in a way worthy of the college. Most students, I believe, attain it.

CHAPTER XIII

HEALTH

Fundamental Importance of Health, The Health Problem

Physical health is clearly a part of an ideal life. If we are normal human beings we desire to rise in the morning with energy, to face each day with eagerness, to eat with hearty appetite, to work with strength, to play with zest, and to get "tired out" in the way which brings sound, refreshing sleep. The regular, easy performance of the bodily functions of respiration, digestion, circulation, excretion, the vigorous exercise of muscles in arm and leg, the activities of the nervous system, all this seems obviously desirable in itself.

When we reflect upon the matter we see that the significance of health is revealed in its effect upon the mind. Upon it depend not only physical efficiency, but also mental efficiency and happiness. Without it we fail to do our best work, and we find our whole outlook upon life clouded. It was wisely said by Lessing that if we are spared ill health we can endure our other troubles. Health is the foundation which if unsound weakens the whole superstructure of life. The exceptional cases of great accomplishment in spite of ill health—that of Herbert Spencer for example—reenforce this truth rather than justify indifference to it. While physical disability is sometimes accompanied by an indomitable will and extraordinary intellectual or artistic gifts, it remains true that life cannot be satisfactory without a basic bodily soundness. This is why writers on ethics universally emphasize care of health as not simply a matter of convenience or common sense, but as a duty of the first order.

Present day civilization involves a considerable danger

of loss of health. Our mode of life tends to dispense with healthy activity, to assume sedentary forms which, physiologically speaking, are unnatural. For thousands of years man used his bodily powers to run and to climb, to hunt for his food, to till the soil, to make his dwelling, his clothing, his weapons; and these occupations gave him health. The progress of civilization gradually turned them over to specialists, until to-day we pay for almost all such services, often without performing others to take their place. Money, machinery, and the division of labor lessen personal effort to such a degree that many of us have a very narrow round of bodily activities, perhaps none that are really vigorous. We attend to a machine, or sit at a desk, or give orders to other people, and our bodies do not get the active use which their inherited constitution requires. We make little movements with our fingers instead of big ones with the big muscles of the trunk, leg and arm, the exercise of which is requisite for the healthy performance of other functions. Rural occupations have of course preserved more of the original, natural and healthful vigor and variety of bodily activity. It is in city life with its many sedentary employments that this special danger chiefly appears. The fact that the population of the country is flowing toward the city, and that the latter has a much larger percentage of the total than it did a century ago, makes the danger conspicuously greater.

With this difficulty goes another no less serious,—strain upon the nervous organism. Along streets and in huge buildings a multitude of sights and sounds beat upon our eyes and ears. The newspaper, the telephone and telegraph give us no rest. Store windows and flaring advertisements demand our attention. Ambition, money making, the struggle for financial existence keep us in a state of tension or excitement. In short we are very much "over stimulated," and the result is a nervous condition intensely antagonistic to health. It is a mistake to suppose that the danger disappears through our "getting used to it." This is a task for the race, not the individual. As the body becomes increasingly saturated, so to speak,

with the poison of continuous, unnatural excitement we may go our way in relative unconsciousness of its condition, but nevertheless the nerves, arteries, muscles and other tissues are degenerating, and often the end comes with a snap, a striking headline in a newspaper, and a tragic blight upon a home.

Fortunately we have become so aware of these dangers that we are on our guard against them. In spite of them our life as a people is increasingly healthy; science reenforces our instincts as hygienic guides, and public intelligence in the matter of health grows rapidly. The play of childhood and youth is extending into maturer years; municipalities are constantly improving their conditions by enlarging public parks, imposing sanitary restrictions, and educating both young and old in regard to the importance of health. As a result many a city is quite as healthy a place as the country which surrounds it. Yet the forces which make for ill health remain, and the danger is one to which we must not be blind.

The reason for making the foregoing statement is the fact that college conditions offer an excellent illustration of the danger. A college is ordinarily a somewhat close packed community by itself, or is situated in a larger one. Its work is primarily mental, its stimulation incessant. The demands of study and habits of diversion combine to lessen the free play of the physical organism and to heighten the nervous tension. Continual crouching over a desk, disregard of diet, relentless use of the eyes, late hours, disinclination to take proper exercise, these are some of the more common evils, and all are departures from the natural, healthy way of living. The outcome in a few cases is nervous breakdown; in many others it is mental sluggishness relieved by forced excitement. The loss of mental efficiency may not be sufficient to be called ill health, but it is a loss; and though the harmful effects of an improper mode of life do not demand the attention of a physician they are nevertheless stored up in the system, perhaps to reappear obstinately long after college days are over.

As in the wider field, however, conditions are such

as to justify optimism with regard to the future. On the whole the college is a healthy place and is becoming more so. College students as a class are healthier than other youth. The danger of ill health is constantly met by sanitary regulations, by facilities for exercise, by habits of right living. Nervous breakdowns are few, and epidemics are rare. What we need to observe is that this fortunate condition deserves our intelligent cooperation, or in other words that we ought to pay attention to the laws of health as a part of our higher education.

Practical Principles.

Without entering the field of technical detail we may note certain broad principles of healthy self guidance. First, most of us are naturally so healthy that our instinctive feelings reliably dictate what is good for us and what is not. Our health instincts are rules of nature, repeated over and over in successive generations until we feel them as blind assurances that we must act or not act in particular ways. Thus hunger calls for food, cold for protection, weariness for rest, pain for any change that brings relief. Instinct likewise tells us to exercise, to play, to sing, to dance. Any alleged rule of hygiene which opposes such instinctive promptings lays itself open to suspicion. Occasionally, of course, we must avoid being misled by momentary impulses, or by the fluency of bad habits which demand gratification; instinct may err, and it may become perverted. But in general health is properly maintained by perfectly natural means with which we are familiar, by regular habits of eating and drinking, of playing and sleeping, according to needs which nature herself reveals in our consciousness. A healthy life is pre-eminently a natural life.

It is of course a mistake to worry about our health, and continually debate with ourselves whether this or that thing is good for us, or whether this or that feeling is a symptom of illness. Questions of food and drink, light, fresh air, clothing, bathing, rest and exercise are properly to be settled on the basis of competent advice, or

by judicious reflection, and then in the form of habits dismissed from the mind. So, too, if we think we are seriously sick we ought to consult a physician; otherwise we ought not to allow ourselves to think that we are sick.

Especially to be avoided is the whole category of "health fads"—vegetarianism, fasting, drinking quarts of water daily, taking ice cold plunges, going without an overcoat in freezing weather, and the like. These are all condemned by the same fact—they are unnatural. The reasoning on which they are based is conspicuously fallacious, and the persons who practice them for any length of time usually appear to be "enjoying ill health." Probably they are applicable to individual cases, but their advocates make them a gospel for all mankind. Unfortunately this misguided philanthropy in propagating hygienic crotchets is often expressed in attractive literary form, and there are few of us who have not been impressed by such literature at one time or another.

Scientific instruction about our physical being and the proper care of it is an appropriate part of higher education. Physiology and hygiene are subjects which not only belong to the curriculum of the college, but deserve more study than they ordinarily get. There is reason, indeed, for including such study among the requirements of the freshman year. As general reading the scientific literature of the subject is for the most part forbiddingly technical, but there is an increasing number of popular books, written by men of unquestioned scientific standing, which serve to direct the casual reader into safe paths. In this field as in others scientific truth is not necessarily so abstruse as to be unintelligible; it may be stated clearly, and the business of popular exposition ought not to be monopolized by clever literary advocates of nonsensical fads. Fortunately the public interest in good health, resulting from awareness of the danger indicated above, has brought forth much literature that is reliable, and that is easily available for the reader who is discriminating enough to ascertain a writer's standing.

Special Needs in Student Life

(1) Care of the eyes. Nowhere does the strain of our civilization fall more painfully and dangerously than upon the eyes. These members were evolved for scrutinizing things more distant than the pages of a book, for vision of larger objects than little black marks on white paper, for rest in darkness rather than protracted use in artificial light. Our abuse of them is often extreme. It is no wonder that the percentage of eye defects, beginning with the early years of school life, steadily increases. Not infrequently these troubles produce headaches and indigestion; and counterwise, disorders in various parts of the body may affect the eyes. Remembering that the occupations into which college graduates go usually need unimpaired vision, and that a single pair of eyes is positively all that any of us can have, it obviously behooves us to take no undue risks with so delicate and irreplaceable a part of our bodily apparatus.

We ought to be careful to avoid reading in a dim light, or facing a strong one. Weak eyes cannot stand direct illumination, and bright sunlight reflected from a white page is harmful. Unsoftened electric light is too strong for some of us, and we have to repel it by the use of an opaque eye shade. Reading in street cars, if practised at all, should be limited to books with large print. And finally, we need to rest our eyes frequently, especially when reading. The little muscles of adjustment around the eyeball cannot stand the incessant strain of focussing vision without protesting in their own fashion, perhaps by inciting a severe headache. It is well to close the eyes momentarily from time to time, or to change their focus by looking off to distant treetops, buildings or hills, and thus give them the rest which their faithfulness deserves.¹

¹So centrally important is this matter of vision that the indifference of college authorities to it is strange. Colleges frequently impose a physical examination upon all incoming students, but leave their vision to their own care, or carelessness. It would be helpful to have a competent oculist examine every student's eyes at the beginning of his college course, and give him the benefit of expert advice.

(2) Exercise. Student life does not ordinarily involve physical exertion, or encourage the forms of exercise upon which health depends. It tends to become sedentary, or nervously active, rather than vigorous in a muscular fashion. "Athletics" in plenty there are, indeed, but unfortunately these are the burden of a small percentage of the student body, while the others do little or nothing but exercise their vocal apparatus as spectators of the fray. The best of gymnasium facilities fail to tempt the majority to take sufficient physical exercise, although there is not the slightest doubt that bodily health and mental efficiency demand this.

The amount of exercise needed in order to maintain health is not large; in fact a few minutes a day is sufficient. Of course if we have an ideal of physical perfection we will labor conscientiously to correct all our physical defects by practising special gymnastics for an hour or two each day. But few will stick to such a plan. Most of us desire simply to keep ourselves in "good condition," and this may be done in a more natural way. Our method may be that of gymnastics, but it is more likely to be play,—friendly contests at tennis, handball, baseball, golf, and the like. The defect of routine gymnastics is their monotony. Exercise needs to be joyful, spontaneous, eager. Its mental conditions and effects are as important as its physical form. If it is merely perfunctory, a dreary grind of mechanical movements according to directions, it is of comparatively little value. Perhaps the indiscriminate requirement of formal gymnastics is better than leaving students entirely to their own self neglect, but it is not the best solution of the problem. A little vigorous play every day is much better.

College exercise should be play, not merely vicarious play by highly trained specialists, but universal play, full of the "play spirit," cooperative, competitive, and as much as possible in the open air. The athletic field monopolized by a few skilled athletes needs to be supplemented if not replaced by a large number of courts and other facilities for healthy sport, all occupied by inexpert but

vigorous youth. It would be wise even to sacrifice some of our beautiful college lawns for the purpose. College men and women possess play instincts, and it is presumably possible to make this kind of physical exercise fashionable among them. The main need is for better facilities. One who appreciates the depth of this need longs to see huge fields filled with hundreds of students engaged in all sorts of open air contests. Something like this will undoubtedly be characteristic of the college of the future.²

(3) Rest. Colleges are essentially restless places. The association of hundreds or thousands of energetic people in a community with scores of activities going on all the time creates an atmosphere of tension and excitement. Study and social diversions combine to produce excessive stimulation, and in consequence there are many cases of over-draft upon the nervous energy of the organism—exhaustion of the nervous system to a level below that of efficiency. Healthy youth seems indeed to have inexhaustible reservoirs of vitality, and endures the pressure without failing, but nevertheless the wear and tear is really going on.³ Sometimes the result is “nerves,” i.e., a heightened irritability or nervousness which threatens prostration; more commonly it is a mental sluggishness, fired only by artificial excitement. Occasionally there is a breakdown which requires long years for recovery.

The danger is increased by the prevalent notion that we can obtain rest by a change of occupation. Within certain limits this is true, as when we turn from study to physical exercise, or from work to light reading. But

² In my own college certain courageous friends used to rise at five o'clock in the morning in order to use the diamond which was at other times reserved for the nine. The logical absurdity in a democratic institution of excluding the many in favor of the few, although all alike pay for use of the athletic facilities, is gradually gaining recognition.

³ The nervous movements which we find ourselves making—twirling a pencil between the fingers, clasping and unclasping the hands, twisting a button, drumming on the chair arm, or tapping the floor with the toe of one's boot—all these are expenditures of energy, sheer waste.

there are degrees of weariness which render any further activity pernicious. If the brain is tired out, physical exercise deepens the fatigue;—what one needs is rest. If we are physically exhausted by hours of athletic practice, it is foolish to try to spend the evening in study;—again, body and mind need rest. The point to bear in mind is that we actually accomplish more by resting thoroughly between periods of work than by turning nervously from one thing to another under the delusion that we overcome our weariness by forgetting it.

Rhythm of work and rest is nature's law for living things. Study hours should be punctuated by moments of mental relaxation; this is the reason for the ten minute interval between classes, and it ought not to be abused by study. Many persons find an afternoon siesta helpful in preparing them for further effort, and of course the accumulated fatigue of the day makes a sound night's sleep requisite for the restoration of energy. With regard to keeping Sunday as a "day of rest," we must acknowledge that our college schedules do not encourage it. The tide of work and play carries us swiftly along through the week, and Saturday usually leaves us unprepared for Monday. Almost every one finds it convenient if not practically necessary to undertake a certain amount of study on Sunday. It remains true, however, that if we set the day apart for peace and quiet, in reading, in attending worship, or in walking into the country, we begin the week with fresh strength and optimism.

The secret of the matter is that *rest is growth*. Physiologically this is well understood, but the mental side of the fact is less obvious, though none the less certain. We know how problems sometimes seem to solve themselves if we dismiss them from our minds and wait for the correct solution to burst upon us spontaneously. We know too that the ideas of genius come from mysterious depths of the mind, so unfathomed by the individual himself that he frequently regards his "inspiration" as a divine gift—which perhaps it is. But we do not sufficiently realize that our best ideas and purposes, our hopes, our faiths and our ideals, incubate during rest,

recreation, day dreaming, even sleep, and that in order to expand our mental horizon and clarify our mental vision we need to give our minds plenty of opportunity to do their so-called "subconscious" work. Rest does not merely regain lost strength, it creates new power.

CHAPTER XIV

COLLEGE LIFE

Development

Broadly speaking, the activity of the college falls into two divisions, namely curricular study and "college life." The former is essentially intellectual, the latter distinctly social. Of course the two kinds of activity are not sharply separate; study has its social aspects, and college life is partly developed to intellectual concerns; but on the whole the distinction is clear. In this and following chapters we shall consider certain features and problems of college life.

No phase of the development of the college is more striking than its increasing complexity of social organization. At the outset there was little or no organized student activity; in fact the spirit of such organization was foreign to the purpose and regime of the college. Study, classroom drill and religious exercises filled most of the day. Play and friendly association were distinctly subordinate. Any form of recreation outside the prescribed and traditional order was *ipso facto* under suspicion.

The pioneers of the development were literary and debating societies, some of which existed in colonial times, and had important functions in forming student opinion on political topics. Most of the organized activities of contemporary college life are products of the nineteenth century, however—some of them of very recent origin. Literary journalism appeared at Dartmouth and Yale in the first decade; religious societies were organized at Harvard and Williams at about the same time; and musical clubs had an even earlier origin. Phi Beta Kappa, the first Greek letter society, was founded at William and

Mary in 1776, but no other fraternities appeared for nearly fifty years. Intercollegiate athletics date from the middle of the century.¹ Many of the organizations were of course ephemeral; the flame of some student's enthusiasm flared up, caught associates, and led to the formalities of a club name, a constitution and bylaws. Sooner or later attendance and interest waned, and the organization expired. Several, however, have had a continuous life from their origin, and now look back upon a dignified history of half a century or more.

At the present time we find an astonishing variety of such groups—fraternities, literary and debating societies, religious associations, musical and dramatic associations, newspaper and magazine boards, department clubs, "current events" clubs, athletic clubs, chess clubs, sketch and camera clubs, political clubs, state clubs, national clubs, cosmopolitan clubs, and a host of others—dozens and scores of clubs in a single institution. When in addition we consider the informal, unorganized reading, talking, playing, "mixing" of everyday life we are led to take a new view of college education.

The point of this view is the acknowledgment that "college life" is not merely recreational, but is also in its own way educative. It does indeed afford recreation, and some of it has this for its primary purpose. Yet we would make a serious mistake if we were to estimate it simply in this aspect and ignore its educative function. Whether such function is important or trivial, valuable or harmful, remains to be seen, but there can be no doubt that the student in all his association with his fellows is *learning*.² Let us look at the matter in this light.

Educational Value

The enterprises of college life have several distinct kinds of educational value. In the first place they offer, as a

¹For an account of this development see Sheldon, *Student Life and Customs*, Chs. II, III.

²President Angell long ago pointed out the then somewhat eye-opening fact that the student learns from his associates just as genuinely as from his books.

rule, an opportunity to learn something about subjects outside the curriculum. Not only the literary and debating society, the current events club and Bible study class, but also the dramatic association, the newspaper board, the state club and others are, in their own more or less informal way, self running college courses. In fact not one of the societies enumerated above fails to conduct regular or occasional discussions or practical exercises which teach the participants something which they are interested to learn. The aim and method may be theoretical or practical, the general understanding of a topic of intellectual interest or the cultivation of artistic skill, but it is in any case an educational aim. As a rule it was this rather than any mere recreational purpose which the founders had in mind.

Critics of "college life" frequently fail to appreciate this aspect of it, the supplementary value which it has in relation to the curriculum. The individual course of study at best includes only a few subjects, and necessarily excludes many with which the student desires to become acquainted. Under the most favorable conditions it is concentrated in purpose and method, and it omits much which should enter into a college education. Especially do matters of current interest in the college and in the world at large fall outside its scope. The organization of college life is the student's way of adjusting himself to this inevitable concentration, of gaining a broader view of human culture. Sometimes he lets this educational activity crowd the curriculum into the background.³

Secondly, college life has educational value because in the spontaneous pursuit of a chosen interest one may learn

³ It cannot be denied that in some notable instances the road to greatness has led not through the curriculum, but rather through byways of zealous study connected with activities of college life. These cases are distinctly exceptional. As a rule college activities, however interesting and profitable, are not properly a substitute for the curriculum. Systematic instruction should remain the central interest of the college student; there should be no doubt about this even though friends think otherwise and some testify that they "got more good" from outside activities than from courses of study. Such testimony may be true as an individual fact, but it does not finally determine educational values.

to do something thoroughly and well. Such effort is self training in argumentative alertness and effective address, in grappling with contemporary problems, in developing artistic talent, and in the practice of conducting meeting and transacting business. Regular courses usually afford little opportunity for oral self expression, and almost none for such practical activities as the production of a newspaper or a dramatic performance. College life calls for practical effort. In some cases there is an astonishing amount of hard work for the love of it.

Generally speaking, however, these enterprises suffer from inert membership. It is so easy to join, and so hard to find time for actual participation! Over organized as the college is, the various groups jostle one another, and many languish periodically through lack of strong self-support. Of course it is not to be expected that they should demand continuous hard work. We are justified in taking membership in them rather easily; and perhaps it is inevitable in all such associations that the burden should fall on the faithful few who are most deeply interested. But we ought not to be merely hangers-on. Occasionally it is a duty to help turn the wheels. On the whole it is wise to keep aloof unless we are willing to take an active part now and then.

Third, college life has educational value of a social kind. These activities are essentially the interests of groups of persons who *cooperate* in the pursuit of them. The individual identifies himself with the group and so with the broad, healthy life of the institution; he adopts a purpose larger than his private aims, and thus acquires a habit of cooperation. When we consider how society is constituted, and how social enterprises are conceived and carried out, we see that it is of the first importance for individuals to learn to work together with common aims and common sympathies, without cross purposes or friction, and to find in the very fact of association a strong motive for doing something that is worth while. This social education is acquired in the various group activities of college life.

For these reasons a college course which lacks partici-

pation in such activities is incomplete. The student who graduates without having helped to maintain at least one organization in which membership is optional, who has taken no part in debate or concert, literary publication or athletic sport, who has not aspired to an editorial chair or held a role in a dramatic cast, has failed to measure up to the wholesome standards of college life. He is an adjunct of the college family rather than a member of it.

Let us observe further that it is peculiarly the function of certain college organizations to educate the college as a whole. Thus the athletic association should cultivate the spirit of fair play; the college newspaper should not only publish college news, but should discuss college questions with wisdom and impartiality for the purpose of creating sound public opinion within the college walls; the musical and dramatic societies should elevate the college taste; the religious associations should provide instruction which aims at the moral and religious welfare of student life. Whether or not these organizations actually perform such service it is properly their business. To some extent they usually do. Colleges would be artistically, socially, morally worse but for their efforts.⁴

We must not leave this aspect of our subject without

⁴In many cases improvement is desirable. College newspapers, too, often show a tendency toward sensationalism and an habitual indulgence in slang, indecent personal comment and athletic braggadocio. On the other hand, there are papers which in their own way are as "newsy," as instructive and dignified as could be desired. There is no reason why the college press should not unify college sentiment in a way which is representative of the common interest and of the ideals of higher education.

So, too, musical and dramatic associations might educate the taste of college students more than they commonly do. American college songs are lacking, as a rule, in dignity, depth of feeling and delicacy of expression; while the production of classical music lies altogether outside the repertoire of most musical societies. In the field of dramatic art notable advance has already been made. Some dramatic associations no longer confine themselves to farce and musical comedy, but produce plays of real worth, occasionally reaching such a pitch of idealism as the presentation of Sophocles, Molière, and Shakespeare. There is an unworked dramatic field in college life itself, its deeper currents and more serious, even tragic incidents.

acknowledging that the unorganized forms of college life, the free association, casual discussion and spontaneous play, also have educational value. No doubt these ordinarily occupy too much time, and are too often utterly trivial in character. But there are possibilities of real helpfulness in the play, talk and jest of the campus. The recluse, no matter how studious, loses something important. Casual conversation, if it consists of an interchange of ideas about matters of living interest, is oftentimes equivalent to a lesson in practical ethics. Incidental recreation serves to reveal life and truth. Of course we ought not to carry on this informal mingling and discussion with a deliberate and solemn purpose of self improvement. It should be, as it normally is, free, spontaneous, self forgetful. As such it properly belongs to college education. Even though we have to deplore the fact that this friendly association usually wastes much time in the discussion of utterly unimportant affairs it remains true that its participants are learning to go through life in a good natured, sympathetic, kindly way.

Excess, The Problem of Regulation

That most colleges have altogether too much "college life" in proportion to the amount of curricular study is an assertion which few impartial observers will deny. Not only instructors within and critics without the college walls but students likewise acknowledge that the incessant round of social activities leaves too little time for the quiet, thoughtful, scholarly mastery of academic subjects.⁵ One

"What with so-called 'college activities' by which he must prove his allegiance to the university, and social functions by which he must recreate his jaded soul, no margin is left for the one and only college activity—which is study. Class meetings, business meetings, committee meetings, editorial meetings, football rallies, vicarious athletics on the bleachers, garrulous athletics in dining room and parlour and on the porch, rehearsals of the glee club, rehearsals of the mandolin club and of the banjo, rehearsals for dramatics, college dances and class banquets, fraternity dances and suppers, preparations for the dances and banquets, more committees for the preparations; a running up and down the campus for ephemeral items for ephemeral articles in ephemeral papers, a soliciting of advertisements, a running up and

belongs to a dozen clubs, taking little active part in any, but nevertheless letting each distract attention and occupy time which should go to more significant concerns. As a result there is nervous tension and inability to get anything done well because there are so many things which need doing all at once. Occasionally, too, the mind of the whole college is usurped by some relatively unimportant matter, and peace is disturbed because of athletic incidents or fraternity conditions. These and other similar consequences of college life tend at the present time to offset its real value.

Regulation is conspicuously needed. Yet the difficulty of giving these matters their rightful place, amount of time, intensity of interest and thoroughness of accomplishment creates a puzzling practical problem. Some colleges attempt to solve it by rules forbidding membership in more than a limited number of organizations, but this method is foreign to the principles of freedom which characterize the college. Moreover, since individual capabilities and the requirements of membership differ widely, an arbitrary limit is sure to prove unjust or futile. And its practical efficacy at best is doubtful.

Equally dubious is the effort to regulate college activities by putting them under formal supervision, and granting credit for participation in them. It is impossible to exercise proper control without overburdening instructors, and in consequence supervision becomes perfunctory and gives way to neglect. Membership is sought as a convenient means of obtaining credit with a minimum of labor, and the desirable spirit of freedom and spontaneity, without which the enterprises lose much of their value,

down for subscriptions to the dances and the dinners and the papers and the clubs; a running up and down in college politics, making tickets, pulling wires, adjusting combinations, canvassing for votes—canvassing the girls for votes, spending hours at sorority houses for votes—spending hours at sorority houses for sentiment; talking rubbish unceasingly, thinking rubbish, revamping rubbish—rubbish about high jinks, rubbish about low, rubbish about rallies, rubbish about pseudo-civic honor, rubbish about girls; what margin of leisure is left for the one activity of the college, which is study?" Professor Gayley.

is lacking. In the case of intercollegiate debating, and possibly the chief editorships of the leading publications, exceptions to this rule may wisely be made, for these require hard, continuous study or practice, and in their own way are subject to intellectual tests. But for other enterprises the motives ought to be spontaneous interest and loyalty to the college. The pleasure of participation should be its own reward.⁶

The appropriate form of faculty control is that of occasional attendance, counsel, criticism and commendation. There is also need of authoritative coordination of college activities in order to secure definiteness of aim, to prevent unnecessary duplication, and to avoid waste of energy. The experiment, adopted in some colleges, of placing all clubs and societies under the friendly supervision of a single authority promises well. But in any case the solution of the problem depends upon the good sense of the individual students. He must acknowledge the primary importance of regular study; he must learn that the college does not need so many side shows, and would be distinctly better off without some of them; he must learn the same truth with regard to his own educational welfare; and finally he must learn to say No, even to his friends, when besought to join enterprises which are of doubtful value, or for which he has no time. A wise and cheerful but firm refusal in such cases means no loss of friends. The problem can be solved not so much by authoritative legislation, elimination, restriction or prohibition, as by rational self control. The demand for thoughtful adjustment of interests which this responsibility imposes upon the student is in itself educative.

*I recall a certain brass band which secured credit as a one hour course of study, though there were those on the faculty who stoutly maintained that its performances should be heavily penalized rather than rewarded. Other forms of activity are equally absurd as sources of college credit. There is no line between those which involve genuine study and those which do not.

CHAPTER XV

COLLEGE SPIRIT

What is "College Spirit"?

The term "college spirit" is most commonly used with reference to athletics. It is the duty of the men of might to join the football squad, of the skilled baseball player to give the nine the benefit of his services, of the student body to support the teams financially and by attendance at games. College spirit demands hard work and much cheering. It calls not only for enthusiasm in play and in celebrating victory, but also for cheerfulness and encouragement in the hour of defeat,—for readiness to welcome a returning team with band and banners even though it bears a load of failure.

But other activities beside athletics are denoted by the term. It includes support of college publications, participation in college enterprises of all sorts, some representative activity on the part of every student. "Try out for the glee club, get advertisements for the magazine, at least join a literary society, but in any case do something for the college. Don't make your relation to it merely that of study. Cultivate a larger social interest of some kind." Such is the spirit of the modern college.

College spirit is not always so praiseworthy, however. Its very enthusiasm sometimes perverts it into passion and lawlessness. Hazing, foolish or tyrannical customs, destruction of property in celebrating victory, theft of sign boards to decorate rooms, even gambling, drunkenness and dissipation are occasionally regarded as exhibitions of college spirit.¹ The explanation is, of course, that these

¹"I don't approve of 'beer busts,'" a college instructor remarked to the writer, "but I would tolerate one just to make sure

performances are expressions of social excitement. Often, as in the case of hazing or betting on games, they are done with some superficial pretense of regard for the welfare of the college.

College spirit signifies loyalty, active loyalty, to the social welfare. Obviously this is why the central application of the term is so commonly athletic: here is the principal unifying agency of the college,—*the* common interest. Here, too, is the supposed objectionableness of the “grind”: his interests seem individualistic, unmindful of society. The various implications of the idea may be hazy or incomplete in the mind of the undergraduate, but its essential significance is clear to him: the individual must sink his individuality or independence in some activity for the group.

“Group consciousness” is a profoundly important fact of society, a genuine “law of nature.” Members of a group, and especially of an organized institution like the college, feel and think and act as do those around them. The family has the sense of kinship, its “family pride,” the city and state their civic consciousness, the nation its patriotism, the regiment its “honor,” the labor union its “brotherhood,” religious sects their denominational feeling. In all such instances the group consciousness expresses itself actively in ways which are the same for all members of the group. It imposes itself upon all through exhortation, example and imitation, social pressure, even through force and penalty. In general it is conservative, tending to continue traditional practices, to perpetuate custom, to suppress individuality. It is at the same time the balance wheel which keeps the social machine revolving steadily, and the living soul which vitalizes the social body and makes progress.

College spirit is evidently a special form of this group consciousness, with its characteristic value and danger of perversion. It is not only desirable; it is indispensable. It supplies the energy for college accomplishment and the “that the college is alive.” Fortunately, most instructors and students are aware that intoxicated excitement is not a sign of healthy vitality.

atmosphere of college happiness. It liberates the soul for action in a larger sphere than that of self interest, and thus enables it to grow. One who does not feel its moving power within him does not really belong to the college.

On the other hand it is often open to criticism, in that it demands unity of feeling and action without self critical thought. Like its political analogue, patriotism, it is sometimes degraded to mere noise, sheer sound and fury signifying folly. There is usually too much emphasis upon concerted, vociferous enthusiasm, and too little upon the quieter, less conspicuous implications of good college citizenship. Athletic earnestness is held to extenuate the purloining of a reserved book from the library, the presentation of a copied essay, or a plunge into dissipation. Correspondingly, as we well know, there is in the nation at large altogether too much noisy "patriotism," and too little quiet, inconspicuous citizenship which patriotically pays taxes with honesty and votes with regularity and sincerity of thoughtful conviction. And, to push the parallel further, just as there is a contemporary demand for a new "civic spirit" which shall elevate and purify social life, so there is likewise a need of a new college spirit, broader than that of the common conception. The latter is fundamentally sound in its insistence upon loyalty to the social welfare. What we require is a clearer vision of what welfare means.²

Needed Forms of College Spirit

The problem, let us remind ourselves, is not that of eliminating existing forms; for the most part these are healthy. It is rather that of making a change of emphasis, of invigorating activity along certain inconspicuous lines. Three such lines suggest themselves: regard for

²The incessant demand for more athletic enthusiasm, even in colleges which are supposed to have achieved perfection of this type of college spirit, suggests that it has reached a pitch of unnatural exaggeration. The mass meetings, the alumni speeches, the imperious complaint of the college newspaper, have a certain ring of artificiality. Such forced excitement is dubiously valuable.

the material welfare of the college, personal helpfulness to inept students, and faithful service to the surrounding community.

Consideration for the material welfare of the college ranges all the way from little decencies and proprieties in the use of equipment to improvement of the campus, erection of buildings, addition to endowment. That college spirit is needed to carry out these more elaborate undertakings is clear; but it is not so well understood that it is college spirit which keeps one from wasting electric light, from monopolizing tennis courts, from littering lawns or class room floors with rubbish, from marking library books, or which prompts one to remove such defects. All this is college spirit because it is unpaid personal service, unselfish loyalty to the welfare of the college.

Second, there is abundant opportunity for helping individual students, particularly that of giving personal attention to those who are not yet adapted to their college environment, whose intellectual or moral difficulties call for kindly counsel. The need of this is the greater since the increasing number of students and the necessary attention of instructors to various matters have largely put an end to the former "individual training." The freshman is but one of a large group, receiving so little personal direction from instructors that the assistance of more experienced students is sometimes his only hope of salvation. Advice and counsel, judicious coaching in study, the example of responsibility and power without pretense of superiority, all this is education, quite as effective as that of the classroom. Upperclassmen both within and without the pale of fraternity life not infrequently give invaluable assistance to inexperienced boys. In my own recollection there stands out clearly the friendliness of one man, older and wiser than I, whose informal but well considered teachings had more weight with me than the erudition of any official instructor. I recall, too, a senior who, with his head and his hands full of study and college enterprises, devoted himself to the task of saving a freshman who was in imminent danger of failure and expulsion. He taught the boy to study, gave personal in-

struction, imparted such college wisdom as seemed requisite, and accomplished wonders of improvement. Probably the younger fellow had never in his life experienced such training. The senior was a college leader, and he carries many memories of intellectual, social and athletic achievement, but I doubt whether any of these give him more satisfaction than the service to his young friend. I sincerely hope that some who read these pages will give themselves the satisfaction of helping an awkward or floundering associate to establish himself firmly in college life. Patience and thoughtfulness in large measure will be needed, but the ultimate return will be correspondingly great. As a manifestation of college spirit no more efficient furtherance of the social welfare could be found.

Finally there is service to the surrounding community. It is college spirit which maintains the philanthropic activity of the college settlement, the gymnasium classes for street boys, the sewing classes for the untaught daughters of immigrants, the social gatherings and the religious services for those who lack home and church. But no less worthy of mention is the work which students do in self support, work in which college spirit signifies faithfulness, intelligence, conscientious sticking to business. Not all student labor is of this sort. In fact there are college towns in which the term is synonymous with carelessness, hasty performance of duty, attention to the twenty five cents an hour rather than to the quality of work done. Unfortunately the name of the college is involved; the poor work inevitably reflects upon the institution. In some degree the reputation of the group is affected by ragged use of a lawn mower or waste in tending a furnace. Yet every student worker is a representative of the college, with the opportunity of expressing his loyalty by doing his work well.

It is difficult for some students to understand social welfare except as social excitement—the singing, cheering, even misbehaving crowd. Just so there are citizens who understand patriotism only as mob pugnacity, army service, or mere noise. Yet loyalty to the social welfare is often most effective in its quiet, even solitary expres-

sions. While inspiration and enthusiasm depend largely upon physical proximity, so that vociferous mass meetings are desirable, it is no less true that some of the finest demonstrations of college spirit are found in the inconspicuous but efficient performance of every day duty.

Custom and Conformity

The spirit of a college is revealed in its customs, just as the character of a person expresses itself in habits. There are athletic customs, social customs, religious customs, academic customs. The practices of concerted cheering, of holding college dances and college prayer meetings, of wearing cap and gown, will serve as illustrations. Some customs are practically coextensive with American college life. Others have wide acceptance. Still others are distinctly local; and, like peculiar personal habits, constitute noteworthy individuality. Thus cheering at games is universal, while the wearing of a "freshman cap" is found in many colleges, and "Tap Day" belongs distinctively to Yale. Some customs are important, others ridiculously trivial. Some are thoughtful and progressive, some degenerate and immoral. But wherever custom is found it expresses the "group sense," the consciousness of belonging to a particular social body. The act of a student in conformity to custom is the expression of the group mind.

It is this larger aspect of custom, its regulative social function, which gives it significance and makes indifference to it seem a serious offence. In colleges which have senior honorary societies election is usually conditioned in part upon conformity. If the candidate has neglected or opposed the college customs he has killed his chance of membership in the group of "representative college men." The sternness, too, with which conformity is exacted from recalcitrant students, for example the freshman who carries a cane, is sometimes in striking contrast to the moral indifference of the group in other matters. Thus if the offender is tipsy he may excite only ridicule. It is much easier to break laws than to defy custom, and the resulting condemnation by public opinion is often

greater. On the whole the group feels that custom rather than law is the true expression of its character.

Custom therefore cannot usually be established by legislation. It may be born in a moment of spontaneous enthusiasm, or grow by imperceptible degrees from an obscure and accidental origin, but as a rule it is not a product of legislative deliberation. Its root is in the impulse of the will rather than the calculation of the intellect. Hence in order to start a college custom it is necessary to perform the appropriate action and let it spontaneously repeat itself. Let this class leave a memorial upon graduation, this company make some excursion, or the whole student body engage in some peculiarly absurd "college circus." If the impulse deserves to live—and sometimes if it does not—it will forthwith strike instinctive roots into the soil of social consciousness. If it is doomed by its own futility no amount of forced repetition will save it.

A practical problem which arises in this connection is that of securing conformity from students possessed of strong or eccentric individuality. In every college there are those who look with contempt upon the ordinary college ways, and who travel a separate road. In others conformity is forbidden by age, by a sense of dignity, or by poverty. Colleges usually have the good sense to let such persons alone, cheerfully excusing or tolerating, or at most ostracising them. But sometimes public indignation rises to a pitch of destructiveness and destroys the irregular hat, or subjects the bumptious non-conformist to an involuntary bath.³ There is humor in such exhibitions of group consciousness, but we must not ignore their childish and arbitrary tyranny. Wise students of course conform to custom in so far as their age, conscience, pocketbook and general common sense permit and usually take pleasure in the social feeling that results. But if one stands aloof the cleft is not properly bridged by using

³ A current newspaper item tells of the appearance of the governor of a large western state upon the campus of the state university on a day when custom decreed that collar and tie should not be worn. He departed with neck bare, but fortunately with unruffled temper.

force. Physical compulsion is not the way for a civilized community to secure conformity. It is simply "lynch law" on a small scale, with perhaps a touch of the ludicrous. If an irreverent soul treats college customs with contempt, the appropriate recourse is that of leaving him alone.

Let us not forget, also, that individuality is the source of reform. Social habit is a power for evil as well as for good, and a particular custom may be in no wise a blessing but a curse. In such cases there is need of some clear sighted, strong willed person to pull the rest of society out of its rut. A few years ago the customary graduation banquet of a certain college became the scene of disgraceful drunkenness. At length the president of a graduating class refused to attend. He was heartily criticized by many of his classmates, of course, but his remonstrance was respected by others, and had a considerable effect in crystallizing the sentiment of the following class, which voted to prohibit liquor from the table.

Here, therefore, we see a line of progress in college life. It is for the recognized college leaders to wield the tremendous force of custom in the establishment of college health. They can lift the college to a higher level by accepting, directing, modifying the customs of the institution. All the intelligence and moral force of the college ought to operate in its college spirit, and it is for certain individuals to give these qualities definite and determined expression.

Hazing, Class Antagonisms

The practice of hazing is so widespread that it may almost be regarded as a standard feature of college life. It is so questionable, however, its motives so thoughtless and its consequences so harmful, that it invites our critical attention.

The source of the practice is found historically in the "fagging" of the early American college, and psychologically in certain traits of human nature. In most institutions the superior authority of older members is recognized, and in the schools from which our own are de-

scended this authority was exercised in regular ways. Freshmen were under obligation to run errands and perform other services for upperclassmen, who in turn gave them assistance in their studies and maintained a big-brotherly oversight of their doings. This relation occasionally took a disciplinary form, with punishment which sometimes ran into brutality. As the college grew, vigorous class antagonism appeared, particularly between freshmen and sophomores, usually turning upon some definite act such as carrying a cane or wearing a high hat. Appearance in public with these insignia of maturity was regarded as ground for assault. The practice of kidnapping class officers on the eve of a class banquet, or of forcibly invading the ceremonies, became prevalent. Under stress of such excitement physical maltreatment, half humorous, half cruel, often followed. Frequently, too, the conditions of dormitory life produced friction which wore itself out in hazing. With the development of fraternities hazing became a common feature of initiation; the more suave the effort to secure a desirable member, the more ingenious and relentless the indignity when once the game was bagged. In many colleges the early weeks of the year are an "open season" for the sport of hazing. The maltreatment is sometimes physically painful, but not ordinarily so; the injury is rather to the victim's pride. The cold plunge, the cropped head, the enforced speech in praise of tormentors, the long walk home in the dark after being carried blindfolded into the country, the nonsensical behavior on the streets such as selling old newspapers or parading with a wooden gun—these and countless other prescriptions are administered to the mind rather than to the body of the unfortunate. Let us also understand the term to mean the tormenting of an individual by a group. The organized or unorganized rows between classes, though they commonly lead to hazing, belong to a different category. The persecution of one student by another is so infrequent that we may disregard it. The peculiar fact which we are considering is characterized by the superiority of numbers on one side.

The psychology of hazing is therefore interesting. In

the hazer's mind are blended a feeling of authority and power, a humorous fondness for seeing human beings make themselves ridiculous, more or less cowardice and natural cruelty. The instinct for persecuting prey is perhaps more deeply rooted in us than we suppose; and certainly the conscious possession of superior strength and authority is in itself a temptation to excessive use. The proffered reason for hazing is always the same—alleged bumptiousness on the part of the "hazee." In so far as the younger brother shows this fault it is traditionally the task of his elders to correct it, and since bumptiousness is more likely to manifest itself to student associates than to college authorities, the task seems to lie in the hands of the former. The neophyte is suspected of failing to appreciate the dignity of the tribe, and is humiliated accordingly. But whatever the propriety of this motive, it is ordinarily mixed with others which are less tolerable. The ruling one is rather the boisterous fun of the thing, the amusing spectacle of some helpless wight condemned to the limbo of the absurd. At worst the dominating spirit is sheer brutality. That hazing usually has a large admixture of cowardice is shown by its reliance upon numbers. Many a quiet, self-reliant fellow has escaped simply by defying the crowd.

The danger in hazing is obvious. The act is essentially lawless and therefore tends naturally to excess. It spreads infectiously, recurring year after year as a chronic disease. One of its conspicuous results is that the victims, helpless against their tormentors, deliberately exact a vicarious satisfaction from other sufferers.⁴ Under such conditions the abuse goes from bad to worse without justice or self-limitation. Now and then it runs to extreme forms which end in permanent bodily injury, insanity, even death. In a recent instance the victim fell from his oratorical post on a barrel, gashed an artery on a fragment of glass and died from loss of blood. Students have been worked into high excitement and then held under a stream

⁴A long suffering fraternity initiate once explained to the writer that he was buoyed up throughout his trials by the reflection that he would enjoy the same sort of fun a year later.

of cold water, so that the shock to the heated brain was of lifelong consequence. Such acts are little short of murder. Fortunately tragedies are rare, but though few they nevertheless constitute a warning against the reckless spirit which prevails in hazing.

Is hazing really needful? Many persons think that if it is properly restrained it provides a kind of social discipline which is valuable. The facts, however, hardly seem to justify this contention. In the first place hazing is seldom if ever properly restrained; the hazers, indeed, are usually individuals in whom self restraint is not a conspicuous trait of character. A wave of hazing, once started, spreads to engulf normally sober participants as well as inoffensive victims, and the group proceeds to cut a swath of outrage. Sometimes the impulse turns upon a solitary, eccentric fellow whose unsocial habit of mind is a natural misfortune rather than a fault. The excuse that such a one needs socializing is foolish. Hazing in such a case is brutality, and brutality does not socialize anybody. The actual instances of bumptiousness are the only ones which can possibly justify hazing, and these are very few, less frequent in fact than arrogance and hypersensitiveness on the part of the offended parties.

That there are "smart freshmen" is undeniable, but it does not follow that hazing is the appropriate corrective for their smartness. Judicious reproof and wise counsel are more effective in the long run, as well as more consistent with the dignity and educational point of view of the college. If a noisy youngster, perhaps coming from a secondary school in which he has been a leading spirit of insubordination, makes himself obnoxious, he needs of course to be taken in hand; but the proper method consists in a self appointed committee of two or three older students laboring with him in private, bringing his juvenility to his attention and recommending maturer behavior. If this educational treatment fails something more forcible may be requisite.

That hazing is inconsistent with the dignity of the college is a truth which our colleges are gradually recogniz-

ing. So much of it is cowardly, cruel, futile, wanton in its invasion of rightful freedom, that it is seen to have no place in an intelligently conducted community. College leaders are not likely to be found participating in it, and the practice is disappearing from leading institutions.

Class fights are not identical with hazing, though they are usually related to it as cause and effect. Tradition has established an attitude of hostility in freshmen and sophomores; the former enter college with fear and determination not to be imposed upon, while the latter expect insubordination and are inclined to be over sensitive. Flaring notices of warning, couched in horribly bad diction, are posted all over the campus, and the atmosphere is tense with expectancy of combat. The cane rush is the great historic way of reaching an amicable adjustment, though various other performances such as "tying up," battling for some stronghold, and the like, are common. Sometimes these degenerate into free for all fights, full of bad blood and danger of injury.

Like hazing these practices masquerade as college spirit, but they are condemned by their irrationality and are gradually disappearing. College spirit demands loyalty to the welfare of the whole college body, not to a particular class. It is compatible with friendly struggle but not with ill natured strife. Hence the direction of progress is clearly that of providing substitutes for the class fight—organized class combats, pushball contests, the tug of war across a pool or stream, track meets and field days full of good natured rivalry. These may be held under the supervision of upperclassmen, and they serve to outlaw the bitter, unorganized row. Here, as often happens in society, advance is made by taking a custom, rationalizing it, and making it a law for the welfare of the whole community.

CHAPTER XVI

STUDENT GOVERNMENT

The Development of the Problem

The American college, as we have seen, faces two fundamentally important problems. One is that of the curriculum—the problem of selecting from the immense and varied range of modern studies those which are broadly related to life, and of making them subjects of earnest pursuit. The other is the problem of social order, and especially of government. In part this has to do with the interrelations of trustees, president and faculty, but equally vital is the proper regulation of student affairs, and it is with this aspect of the problem that we are especially concerned. Let us begin by observing its development.

In its origin the college was closely akin to the family and the church. Its life was simple, its dominating ideals religious, its students were youthful, and its faculty stood *in loco parentis* to them. In consequence its government was mainly a matter of rules and discipline. Theoretically this condition remained in force through most of its evolution, but practically we observe a remarkable change; the college gained a certain political character. The religious school with quasi-domestic government became the civic community, or even a higher educational state—not large, it is true, but still in its own small way a political body. Its numerous subordinate organizations such as classes, clubs, athletic teams, publications and the like, with their elections, their money raising, their various activities and uncertain limits of authority, must be regulated through new forms of government. These were matters of community citizenship, and correspondingly the student became essentially a college citizen. Government, instead of

being the disciplinary enforcement of rules, tended to become the establishment of laws in accordance with democratic sentiment. Expansion in size, the increasing age of students, developing conceptions of education and the political atmosphere of the youthful nation all served to strengthen this trend.

The general tendency was therefore democratic. Even in the paternalistic regime of the early college there was a basis for this; students managed their own affairs to some extent, and new organizations naturally assumed independence. The increasing complexity of college life passed beyond the possibility of detailed supervision by the faculty, formal experiments in organized self government began to appear. The idea of a student court was proposed by Thomas Jefferson for the University of Virginia, and other colleges followed suit; but in general these experiments, except in respect to the honor system of conducting examinations, were without lasting significance. At a later period we find new projects, the most elaborate being a complex system of government which was instituted at the University of Illinois in 1868, and which suffered varying fortunes for several years but ultimately perished. The Amherst senate, dating from 1883, was more successful. In recent years the self governing principle has been widely applied in colleges and universities,¹ and has even crept into the lower schools.

Has student government proved successful? There is plenty of testimony that it has. Though its history includes records of decrepitude and failure, these are overbalanced by cases of efficient operation; and they seem not to reflect upon the general principle, but rather to indicate unfavorable conditions and inappropriate forms of

¹This is true of self government of a formal type. Of course, student affairs regulate themselves to a great extent apart from any political scheme. The organization of societies, election of officers, raising of funds, conduct of social functions, holding of meetings, and numerous other activities commonly proceed with little reference to faculty authority, or at most with only a perfunctory permission. While the old *in-loco-parentis* theory remains in many colleges, there is nevertheless a continual enlargement of student control.

application. No democratic government proceeds without hitches and occasional upsets. The important question is whether the application of democratic principles facilitates a general approach to good order. On this point the evidence is strongly in favor of student government. The reports of college presidents, deans and faculties who are observing it at close range is almost unanimously to the effect that offences and disciplinary problems are lessened by placing responsibility for social order in the hands of the college population.

From the standpoint of the college authorities there appear to be three soundly practical reasons for entrusting governing power to students. First, they best understand actual conditions and needs; in matters which require intelligent regulation they are less likely to slip into pitfalls of unwisdom, to make mistakes which demand reversal and so bring discredit upon authority. Second, they are more inclined to obey rules of their own making. There is less excitement in disobeying one's own enactment, and justice takes a sterner form when dispensed by student authorities. Third, the faculty is relieved of an unwelcome burden and is left free to engage in teaching and study. In consequence student respect is enhanced since regard for faculty scholarship is not lessened by experience of administrative incompetence. The general outcome is good order, an *entente cordiale* between students and college authorities, and a better atmosphere of instruction.

Training for Democracy

Furthermore, the college is interested in establishing student government because its graduates become citizens and deal directly with public affairs. Upon it therefore rests the obligation of providing training for citizenship, and of discharging into society not merely a sprinkling of cultured scholars, nor a stream of acquisitive individualists, but a powerful current of socialized men and women, democratically minded, broad of vision, intellectually and morally qualified to face the problems of our national life.

This obligation is of especial importance at the present time because of its bearing upon the subject of political

internationalism. The participation of our country in the war now raging can be morally justified in the minds of intelligent persons only as the means by which, in President Wilson's phrase, "the world must be made safe for democracy." To accomplish this end, however, is not the same as to produce the democracy; the latter can come only as citizens and future citizens are instructed in the ideas and practices which constitute it. Not through channels of force but rather through those of education will the tide of democratic idealism ultimately spread over the nations. War at best merely clears the ground; the constructive work remains to be done.

In large part the leadership in this movement must come from the college. As we have seen, a large proportion of the leaders in all departments of our national life are drawn from the ranks of college graduates, and this is particularly true of the political leaders of the nation. Probably to an increasing extent the men who guide the ship of state will obtain the ideas by which they steer her course from their college training. Furthermore the less conspicuous but no less important unofficial leadership of the college-bred in communities throughout the land will draw society into that course to which higher education points. The responsibility of presenting ideas of democratic citizenship—world citizenship as well as that within the nation—will inevitably rest in large measure upon the young men and young women who go from the college.

Is not this prospect as magnificent as the responsibility is grave? Is there any respect in which higher education is more valuable than in its potency of hastening the day of democracy, the day of international peace and good will, toward which nations are now struggling through seas of blood? To establish this point of view and to discover the precise methods by which the ideal may progressively be realized is the supreme duty of the college at the present time.

How may it give appropriate training for citizenship? Partly, no doubt, through sound instruction in ethics, political science and kindred subjects. The democratic point of view, it is to be hoped, will receive in increasing amount

a clear theoretical presentation. A practical training is equally needed, however, and this practical training can come only through the operation of self government in the daily life of the college. The antiquated conception of school authority—an autocracy which imposes its will upon its subjects, who are inclined to rebel and to evade duty ingeniously—is hopelessly inadequate. It must go, and in its place must come the conception of an educational community in the administration of which all parties cooperate for the common welfare. This conception of a full fledged college democracy characterized by sound principles, rational methods and steady habits of government is an ideal for the college of the future. Student government is a step toward the attainment of the ideal.¹

Principles of Student Government

Three main types of political organization within the college have been evolved, namely the honor court, the dormitory association, and the central council or assembly for the control of student affairs. The last may include both the others, and in fact often does so. Its field of regulation comprehends examinations, residential conditions, student publications, athletics, fraternities, various other student organizations, and occasional disciplinary matters which concern the welfare of the college, such as abuse of library privileges, theft, drunkenness and general bad conduct. Some of these interests may be under separate control, or all may be included in one organization. In this case superior authority is vested in a governing body to which all minor organizations are subordinate. Thus the student council may possess the right to regulate the action of the college newspaper or of a fraternity,

¹ Every college prides itself upon being "democratic." There is truth in this belief, and the fact is a solid foundation for the development which is needed. Distinctions between the sexes, race distinctions, even distinctions of color, have less significance here than elsewhere. Generally speaking, the college does not confer privilege except as it is earned, and this, of course, is the spiritual essence of democracy.

though it wisely leaves these to their own devices as far as possible, and interferes only under extraordinary conditions for the welfare of the college. The governing functions of such a body are legislative, judicial and administrative. It not only makes laws, but it deals with individual offences, appoints committees to carry out college projects, and the like. In short it establishes and maintains social order.

Student councils are of two types, the small, non-partisan senate, and the larger assembly composed of representatives of different classes. Which of these types is preferable? I am inclined to say the former, on the ground that it is more efficient. A large council is unwieldy; a small group can deliberate and act more quickly and independently. Being non-partisan, it is less likely to develop unpleasant antagonisms, whereas "representatives" may feel responsibility to their constituents rather than to the college at large. In affairs involving different classes, or fraternity and non-fraternity interests, or athletic privileges, or a questionable utterance of the college paper, or the theft of a book, or a prohibition of dormitory disorder, justice is more likely to issue from the reflections of a few of the best men in college than from a large body made up of heterogeneous factions. Perhaps the very fact of partisan desire for representation is a reason for establishing a higher point of view. In any case it seems to me that the most desirable form of government is that of a small group of seniors, men who have had the most college experience and who are naturally above petty partisanship.

Three conditions seem necessary for successful operation of student government. First, the student body must elect officials who can be depended upon to act in the interests of the college—a qualification which may exclude the athletic hero, the brilliant speaker, and the social favorite, excellent as they may otherwise be, and which may be found in some less conspicuous fellow whose distinguishing characteristics are those of quiet firmness and thoughtful attention to whatever business he takes in hand. Power, good nature, breadth of vision, fearlessness in standing for

the right,—these are the requisites of the college leader.²

Second, there must be willingness to be governed. If there is continual demand for unreasonable liberties, or if a minority tries to upset the established order because it cannot have its own way, only failure can result. Democracy depends upon confidence in the wisdom and good intentions of constituted authorities, and upon willingness to accept their decision as law. The true democrat yields cheerfully when outvoted, subsides when a question is authoritatively settled, and at all times exercises faith that the government is doing the best it can. It is a strong recommendation of student government that it affords training in these qualities of character.

Third, there must be cooperation between the faculty and the student officers. The former must resign authority while standing ready to help in dealing with particular problems. It is important to note that authority must be surrendered even at the cost of occasional erratic use. If student officials feel that a hand is over them, constantly ready to interrupt proceedings unless they give satisfaction, they will manifest a lack of earnestness and enthusiasm. Counterwise, they must remember that they are responsible, not simply to the student body, but also to the college authorities and to the community at large. In matters which vitally affect the welfare of the college they may need to seek the advice of older and more experienced persons.

Of course it remains true even in the most completely self governing student body, that the college authorities

²“College politics” bear an unsavory reputation. The political genius of college youth not only leads to party organization, but occasionally to chicanery. At worst the college becomes a dirty puddle of cheap politics, with mud-slinging and bribery as characteristic features. Vote trading, invitation to social functions, even cash payment serve to carry the day. Combination on grounds of common interest, fraternal, scholarly, athletic, religious, is perhaps inevitable, but it certainly ought not to signify the suppression of individual judgment. Successful democracy depends upon an electorate which pays attention, not to personal friendships, or the glory of a fraternity, or mutual gains, but simply to the ability of a candidate to govern with wisdom, firmness and good nature.

have the right to interfere. Just as trustees or regents have a right to regulate the immediate administration of an institution, but show wisdom by refraining from such interference, so the faculty is still authorized to regulate student affairs in detail, but with good judgment relegates responsibility to the participants themselves. Only in extraordinary cases, when anarchy appears imminent and firm control is needed does the higher power take matters in hand. This point is important. Student government does not imply permission to do anything which ignorance or impatience may dictate. Mistakes are endurable with patience, but recklessness is fatal to self government; and while perfect harmony cannot be expected order must be preserved. In general, however, the natural thoughtfulness of student officers, aided by more experienced council, can be depended upon to solve special problems wisely. The bulk of the testimony from college authorities, as we have already said, is commendatory.

In any case student government must be regarded as a growth. Successful operation is not likely to come all at once. The plan should be worked out thoughtfully, with reference to local conditions and to the conceptions of political science; this preliminary caution will forestall many difficulties. But formal organization, no matter how expert, is only a first step. There is no magic in the term "self government" which eradicates lawlessness and creates prosperous democracy in a day,—in short which insures ability to govern oneself. Officials have to gain political wisdom by experience, and citizenship has to develop self restraint. Mistakes will be made, and any college which expects perfectly harmonious conditions to ensue upon the enactment of a constitution is likely to be disappointed. More than one attempt has failed because the governing body governed too much or too little, or because its constituency refused to accept its decrees. The principal danger is that of hastily assuming responsibilities for which there has been no adequate training. Under such conditions a brief period of inept activity, vigorous but inconsiderate, is sure to be followed by disintegration of authority and a virtual return to the *status quo ante*. Initial

organization is only the first step. The proper spirit is a more gradual attainment.

Self-Government and Freedom

Student government is a kind of machinery for producing and maintaining college order—better, perhaps, than other kinds, but by no means infallible. Its working depends on the persons who compose it; in the last analysis its basis is individual, the habit of governing oneself. Its peculiar advantage is that it provides favorable conditions for the exercise of self control. By its frankness and justice it checks irregularities of conduct and encourages individuals to regulate their lives thoughtfully. But its foundation is personal self control; unless students can govern themselves as individuals they can hardly do so in combination.

College students are too commonly regarded as college boys and girls rather than as college men and women—as grown up children whose childishness is charming even though occasionally vexatious. This view is wrong. Waywardness, thoughtlessness, irresponsibility are essentially inconsistent with the meaning of higher education. They show a failure to attain maturity, and the failure is the worse when the person who behaves as a child demands that he be respected as a man. One who enters college thereby undertakes the self government by maturing intelligence; he commits himself to the principle of reflection. Thoughtfulness in practical life, this is the great desideratum, not in the least incompatible with the buoyancy, the humor, the vigor and fun of college life.

This is freedom. As we have already seen, freedom does not mean obliviousness to law; it means action in accordance with self-imposed law. Political freedom is the condition in which society makes laws for itself and obeys them, and individual freedom has a similar implication. No one deserves the former unless he can exercise the latter. College students are really free only in so far as they are dominated by ideals of self development and social welfare. Student government is an expression of this state of mind.

CHAPTER XVII

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Origin and Development, The Problem

"College athletics" are a striking and momentous feature of contemporary college life. In so far as they consist of physical exercise, and especially of games played by students within the college, their value is unquestionable. They are a sign of physical and moral health. The development of intercollegiate sport, however, has brought a mixture of good and evil which is not so easily evaluated, and which often constitutes a serious problem of college administration. Let us observe the growth of this problem.

Intercollegiate athletics are hardly more than half a century old. The first contest of which we have record was a boat race between Harvard and Yale in 1852, a somewhat impromptu affair if we may judge from the remark of a participant that his crew had rowed together only a few times for fear of blistering their hands. Intercollegiate baseball began in 1858, football in 1872, and track athletics at about the same time, though these sports had of course existed in college previously in an informal and unsystematic fashion.¹

The rapid development which followed shows three successive stages: first, that of expansion and organization; second, the dominance of athletics in college life; third,

¹In the early American college there were simple games of the baseball and football type. Princeton had a boat club in 1843. The curriculum of the colleges called for no physical exercise, and the college equipment provided no facilities for it, though there appeared at Harvard in the first quarter of the nineteenth century a preliminary burst of athletic interest which took form in a basement gymnasium. The modern type of college gymnasium dates from about 1860.

systematic regulation. For the most part we are still in the second of these periods, though many colleges are entering upon the third. The prominent features of the current stage of development are the following: (1) Intercollegiate athletics constitute the common interest of the college body. The games produce the feeling of social solidarity called "college spirit," since the college regards the players as its representatives, and witnesses the combat as its own. In its extreme form this sentiment holds the intellectual life of the college in contempt, and cultivates organized warfare against other institutions. (2) Actual participation is limited to a small part, in some cases only two or three per cent, of the student body, while the huge majority are only spectators. Furthermore most of the active interest is devoted to one sport, football, which has gained prominence on account of its combination of muscular skill, mental strategy and sheer physical force. There is no spectacle in all sport quite like that of twenty-two powerful young men trying to advance a ball up and down a hundred yards of battle field, with thousands of applauding spectators banked up on each side of the fray. (3) The sports have undergone scientific improvement to a remarkable degree. Severe, elaborate, long continued training, applied to exceptionally powerful bodies, has produced wonderful expertness. Individual records are repeatedly broken, team play is exceedingly complex, and the players frequently pass into positions in professional sport. Coaches receive high salaries. A special training table is maintained. Enthusiasts invent ingenious mechanical devices to perfect physical efficiency. (4) Intercollegiate sport has gained remarkable publicity. Newspapers systematically magnify the social enthusiasm of the college and communicate it to the public at large by describing preliminary practice, making comparison of contestants, and reporting contests in fine detail to the extent of whole pages. The result is the attendance of thousands at games, and the interest of many thousands more. (5) Certain evils have come clearly into the foreground, particularly a win-at-any-cost spirit which nourishes professionalism, fraud, unsportsmanlike conduct, and

even reckless brutality toward opponents. There is also financial extravagance and tricky management. Last but not least, there is diminished interest in study and a false representation of higher education to the public at large.

It is this phase of the subject, namely the evils of intercollegiate athletics, which constitutes our problem. Are these defects offset by unmistakable benefits? What is the net value of intercollegiate sport? How can we eliminate the bad features and preserve what is good? In order to answer these questions let us look at the matter more closely.

The Value of Intercollegiate Athletics, Benefits and Evils

- From the standpoint of college administration—the point of view of the college authorities—intercollegiate athletics
- ① are usually regarded as a desirable adjunct of college education. They belong to a well rounded institution, they show that the college is in a class with its competitors, they signify college health. In a general way they serve
 - ② as an advertising medium, the result of which is increased attendance, tuition fees, and fame. They constitute a
 - ③ common interest for administrative officers, faculty, student body and alumni, and so make for social unity as against social disintegration. Especially do they form a living and lasting link with the alumni, and a means of retaining their loyal support in financial and other projects, for
 - ④ college graduates continue to scan the newspapers for athletic news of their own college family, and games recall enthusiastic thousands who have long since passed outward through the college gates. Furthermore, athletics
 - ⑤ have a certain regulative function, since they exhaust in a relatively harmless way the energy which might otherwise be spent in mischief or vice.² Of course they occasionally lead to lawlessness—stealing fences to make triumphant bonfires, tormenting policemen, invading theaters, indulging in good natured rioting and more or less dissipation—but for the most part these misdemeanors are easily

² "I couldn't handle these hundreds of fellows at all," a college dean once said to the writer, "but for their games." He knew their value as an escape valve for blowing off surplus steam.

excused, since the infectious good humor of victory extenuates the offence.

On the other hand the college administration must reckon with the fact that there is danger of overdoing athletics, of giving the public an impression that the college is an athletic club whose functions are largely those of amusement, and whose disregard of property, not to mention public peace and quiet, is intolerable. The college cannot claim support from the public if it is not seriously engaged in genuine education. The internal administration may also be impeded by athletic interference with study and with class discipline. Delinquent members of teams sometimes subvert the morale of a class by securing sympathetic condonement of their delinquency, and the college newspaper, backed by alumni, subjects instructors to harsh criticism and even to insult. All this exaggerated exaltation of athletics militates against the efficiency and self respect of educational authorities.

Balancing these pros and cons we find it somewhat difficult to decide whether intercollegiate athletics are a desirable asset to college administration or not. Let us see how the problem stands in relation to the student body.

In the first place we must recognize the fact that the games are most entertaining features of college life. Every healthy soul has an instinctive fondness for a contest, a liking to witness if not to participate in it. The tribal spirit, the joyous desire of the savage to make war upon his enemies, is in us, even though it has become civilized and now acts by proxy. Accordingly, the spectacle of representative warriors on gridiron or diamond or track, fighting to win victory for the college, is agreeably exciting. This is not in the least reprehensible. Under proper conditions it is simply wholesome human nature.

Secondly, intercollegiate sport is a social interest which tends to deepen democratic feeling. Nothing in the history of college athletics is more creditable than their placing of all students on the same level. Rich and poor, aristocrat and plebeian, freshman and senior, all have the same relation to the game; it belongs to all alike. Exceptions

are rare, and when they occur, as in the selection of players from motives of personal favoritism, they are unsparingly condemned. The unifying agency of the common interest acts upon student and instructor, obscuring cleavages and encouraging friendship. It may also be extended to competitors, since contests provide an opportunity for the exercise of hospitality and good fellowship, and are a means of developing a chivalrous attitude in sport.

Third, the general ideal of health and of physical expertness is communicated to the student body. Though only a few "make the team" many try for it, and others take exercise more frequently than they otherwise would. The excitement of merely watching a game offsets the tendency to physical sluggishness; and the moral effects are in part distinctly good. Sport lessens petty mischief and disorder by turning attention to something else, and by affording an outlet for surplus energy. Generally speaking, health promotes morals. Even the incessant talk about athletics, so irritating to those who would like to have college students indulge in more scholarly discussion, has at least the merit of preventing the mind from running to worse subjects.

* Against these merits we must set down the fact that athletics often interfere with study, and tend to diminish student respect for scholarship. The difficulty is not that sport actually requires a great deal of time; it is rather that it wrongly becomes the center of interest, so that one finds it hard to keep his mind on his work. The recent game or the coming one constantly invites discussion, class-work seems a bore, and scholarship loses vitality. Occasionally there is a concerted student demand for relief from study and for faculty concessions to athletics, but for the most part the condition is not active hostility; it is a dead lack of enthusiasm for intellectual pursuits. This is a matter of degrees. Some students hardly feel it. But many unquestionably lose in scholarly equipment for the future because scholarly interests are stifled by other concerns.

Moreover, American college athletics have become so

serious a business, and the importance of winning is so exaggerated, that the student body sometimes develops a profoundly wrong attitude—toleration of unfair practices, approval of dishonesty, encouragement of trickery, and concealment of professionalism—all in order to win. Acts of managers and of players which are known to be dishonorable are glozed over by the superficial justification, "Others do them and we must." On the field there is unsportsmanlike conduct toward opposing teams, a forced draught of incessant, meaningless noise which is childish and which often degenerates into a practised effort to "rattle" opponents. The result is not only a bitter and nasty kind of "sport"; it is an unwholesome kind of citizenship, for this condition means that the college is sending out into society men who are ruthless and who condone unfairness because it glorifies their own social group. Remembering that we learn our lessons in fairness largely through play, what shall we make of a play spirit which works in just the opposite direction?

The evil of an over strained athleticism appears at its worst in the form of vice. Gambling is held to be "supporting the team." Drunkenness and dissipation are regarded as appropriate methods of celebrating victory. Disregard of law—an ominous thing in the view of those who know the growing danger of law breaking in American life—becomes a joke. We even find a type of student, the "cheap sport," who personifies these evils. Lawless, vicious excitement is requisite for his happiness and essential in his character.

So much for the effect of athletics upon the student body. As before, we find good and bad together, and no clear balance in the matter. What are the conditions in the case of the players?

On the credit side of our account we may note the enjoyment of the sport and the health which results from vigorous physical exercise. The common effort leads to firm friendships, and the incidental travel and contact with other colleges gives breadth of view and an ability to "mix." At least equally valuable is the unselfish loyalty which the game demands, the generous giving of time and

energy for a social purpose and for the satisfaction of representing the college. It is worth while to learn to fight good naturedly for one's tribe, and perhaps it is no mere coincidence that the recent history of social reform contains the name of more than one powerful leader with an athletic record.

Unquestionably the strongest argument in favor of athletics, from the players point of view, is their disciplinary value. Some men, looking back upon their athletic experience avow with frank fervor that it was the most profitable part of their college education. They were taught to obey orders, to keep in condition, to work harmoniously with the rest of the team, to face opposition unflinchingly, to take victory and defeat in the right spirit. This is "individual training" of a particularly effective kind. The coach, an expert in his own field, gives personal attention to the candidate such as the latter receives nowhere else in college, sometimes with the result of producing not only technical expertness, but a considerable change of character. Many an undisciplined will has been bent to the needs of the game by stern command which brooked no disobedience, and wayward minds have been permanently regulated through being thus inflexibly subordinated to law. The faculties of close attention and quick judgment, the habits of obedience and persistence, have a somewhat general application; and in the cultivation of them the training of intercollegiate sport is truly educative.

But there are equally unmistakable evils. The physical training is usually excessive from the normal standpoint of health, with the result that the body is not fitted for normal life. When the training is suspended it begins to fatten in an unhealthy way. In addition there is danger of special injury, the broken limb, the overstrained heart, or some more subtle organic weakness which tends to shorten life. The reaction of "breaking training" is itself physically as well as morally unhealthy.

Further, the exaggerated importance attached to successful contests engenders a professional spirit, and in particular a win-at-any-cost spirit, which is exceedingly bad. High salaried coaches, training tables, secret practice,

expensive equipment and service, all indicate an excess of zeal that is not properly the spirit of amateur sport. The unaccustomed luxury in travel and hotel accommodations is insidiously corrupting, as is all luxury which we do not earn, and the excessive publicity leads to undemocratic egotism. Still worse are the unfairness and brutality toward opponents on the field—the foul tackle skillfully made, the underhanded blow or wrench in a scrimmage, the boxing of a runner, and so on. Undoubtedly the majority of college athletes are clean, fairminded men, but it is equally true that intercollegiate sport shows much disgraceful conduct, that players are deliberately coached in unfair tactics and brutal acts, and that under the tremendous strain of the contest good men do bad things. In short, intercollegiate athletics under present conditions tend in many respects to be demoralizing; the win-at-any-price spirit too frequently descends to dirty and dishonest levels.

Let us consider, too, the ironical inappropriateness of the term "student" as applied to one who does not study. Time is stolen and interest is palsied by constant demands of practice, by long absence from classes on athletic peregrinations, by the familiar inability to serve two masters. Sometimes there arises a double standard of scholarship—one for the members of teams and another for the rest of student body. Addiction to "snap courses," special pleas for excuse from regularly assigned tasks, even deliberate and systematic cheating, are not infrequently regarded as unavoidable conditions of athletic proficiency.³ It is painful to think of this sort of athlete as a "representative" of the college and of his fellows.

The most serious charge is that of dishonest profession-

³ Published statements to the effect that the scholarship of athletes is not only above the average, but is highest during the athletic season, seem to me deceptive even when backed by statistics. In such cases I would like to know what courses were elected, who were the instructors, how large were the classes, how they were conducted, how much written work was required, and various other facts which experience has taught me to regard as pertinent. Considering the rigorous demands of athletic training, if such statements are true, they reflect most seriously upon the standards of the institution. Modern college athletics, at least for most individuals, are incompatible with hard study. *

alism. Expert athletes are so much in demand that they command a price, and as payment is inconsistent with the principle of amateur sport it must be made covertly. In an ingenious variety of ways which appear innocent or plausible on the books the management succeeds in defraying the college expenses of the gifted player; as a result the individuals concerned are corrupted by the dishonesty of the transaction, and the representation of the college by "amateurs" who are really professionals in disguise is a joke and a disgrace. The surreptitious financing of college athletics is a dark streak in their history. One authority, indeed, calls the decades just past the "period of systematic prevarication," and the evil practice unquestionably continues. Perhaps the distinction between amateur and professional athletics cannot be maintained under American conditions, but if so it would better be frankly abandoned.

Before leaving this part of the subject let us particularly notice the relation of college athletics to those of the secondary school. To some extent the example of the college is good, in that it promulgates the idea of healthy exercise, and draws within the scope of higher education youths who would otherwise not gain its advantages. On the other hand the school sometimes outruns the college in imitation of its athletic abuses—rowdyism, professionalism, and contempt for study; and though the college cannot justly be held entirely responsible for the evils, there is no doubt that its example and influence have too often been lamentable.

In one respect it is most seriously to blame. It has deliberately and systematically invaded the secondary schools in recruiting athletic material, and has spent time, energy and money in procuring promising "stars." Boys are "induced" to attend this or that institution; they are invited to visit it as its guests, sometimes with the presence and eloquence of the president to increase the attractiveness of the occasion. Loyal alumni arrange huge preparatory school track meets, welcoming all comers, and lavishing entertainment upon youngsters who are more than likely to have their heads turned by it. Of course this procedure

implies subsequent "inducements" of various kinds to enter the college in whose name the meet is organized, and as a result boys sustain, perhaps for years, a false position and dishonorable financial relations for which the college is primarily at fault.⁴

The upshot of the foregoing discussion is that the problem of the value of intercollegiate athletics is very complex. It bears upon the purpose and welfare of the college in various ways, and it concerns all four constituent bodies, trustees, faculty, students and alumni. Advantages and disadvantages are evenly balanced, desirable benefits incidentally involve serious evils, causes and effects are unclear, specific features of the problem are exceedingly perplexing. The one certainty is that the evils must not be allowed to continue. What can be done to eliminate them?

Regulation

Few students of the problem believe that intercollegiate athletics ought to be abolished, but all agree that they

⁴The following excerpt from a daily paper reveals the evil: "Graduate-Manager A—— is at work arranging for the annual interscholastic track meet which will be held this year on May 10. . . . Besides being a big advertisement for the university, the meet means much to the 'preppers,' for they receive handsome cups and medals, and also travelling and other expenses paid. A—— is sending out circular letters to all the schools of the state, telling the students what is aimed at and inviting them as guests of the university, offering medals, cups, and, above all, the hospitality of the college during the many events of junior week-end." The latter include baseball games, dramatics, and other social events, the total effect of which is admirably calculated to give the youthful visitor a thoroughly one-sided idea of college life, and to undermine the discipline of the secondary school. Coldly and impartially judged, is this sort of thing good for the younger brother? How can the schoolboy help getting what is vulgarly known as a "swelled head"? He begins his college career in an entirely wrong state of mind, and not infrequently comes to the end of it by expulsion for low scholarship. Colleges, including their administration, athletic management and alumni, ought in self respect and for the good of the institution to abandon such exploitation. It is a cheapening of the idea of college education, and it is exceedingly bad for the boys.

imperatively need regulation.⁵ No single specific will accomplish reform, however; the problem must be attacked from different sides and in various ways. There are three principal lines of effort along which improvement has been made and further progress may reasonably be expected. They are those of sound management, of faculty requirements of scholarship, and of student insistence upon fair play.

The business of managing intercollegiate athletics has grown to such proportions as to demand mature judgment and responsible action. The complex arrangements, the direction of men and the handling of money call for wisdom and reliability. There are institutions in which the athletic budget for a single year runs from fifty to a hundred thousand dollars, and the gate receipts of a single game mount high in the thousands. In consequence of this growth dangerous tendencies have again and again come to light, tendencies to unwise expenditure, to sheer extravagance and to misuse of funds in supporting clandestine professionalism. In fact, many of the prevalent evils are distinctly traceable to the money root; and the lack of proper financial publicity has shown itself to be clearly akin to certain well known tendencies of American "big business"—not a good example for the financing of college athletics. These conditions are avoided in leading institutions by entrusting the management to an experienced alumnus who is responsible to a directorate composed of representatives of the faculty, the alumni, and the student body. Incidentally the proper auditing and publication of accounts serves to prevent financial mismanagement.⁶

⁵In a few cases the extreme action of abolishing intercollegiate sport, wholly or in part, has been taken, and of course without disastrous consequences, either student insurrection or loss of attendance. Yet this is not the remedy to be sought, partly because it is opposed by the overwhelming sentiment of students and alumni, partly because there are better ways of curing the diseased member than total amputation.

⁶Since much money has proved to be the root of athletic bad practices, it has been proposed that this be cut by excluding the public from games, either directly, or indirectly, by dispensing with grandstands. This seems to me to belong to the large category of reforms which are genuinely impracticable. It is im-

One point which seems clear is that games should be played only on the grounds of the competitors. Athletic spectacles in distant cities for the sake of gate receipts are unjustifiable.

Correlated with this reform is the expansion of the "athletic association" to include the whole student body. Every member then pays an athletic tax, sometimes through the college office, and thereby gains admission to all games, as well as a voice and vote in control, in electing officers, and in determining matters of general policy. The advantage of this method of regulation is that it encourages everybody to take an active interest in athletics. It tends to make them everybody's business, and to prevent them from becoming the enterprise of a sporting oligarchy. At the same time the democratic principle leads to cooperative action on the part of several colleges; and dual agreements or larger leagues accomplish by concerted effort the elimination of abuses and the establishment of rules which all must observe under heavy penalties for evasion. Experiments which a college is unwilling to undertake alone are willingly made in company with others. The result is a gradual but universal uplift of moral tone.

The all important duty of faculty authority is that of requiring players to be genuine college students, which means requiring them to maintain creditable scholarship. Faculties sometimes impose direct restrictions upon athletics, but except in so far as these are related to scholarship requirements they are hardly the part of wisdom. The counsels of a faculty room are too likely to express ignorance and impatience, and their ingenuity is considerably less than that of the undergraduate in evading them. Faculty regulation is most successful when it defines eligibility in terms of scholarship and resolutely maintains

possible to draw any clear line between the part of the public which is rightly interested—the alumni, and the friends and relatives of students—and those for whom a contest is merely an entertaining spectacle. Also something may be said in favor of this means of keeping the public interested in the college. The recent building of huge stadia shows a current of sentiment too strong to be bluntly checked. It may, however, be diverted into channels of sound financial method.

standards. In support of this effort there is good reason for not allowing first year students to participate in inter-collegiate contests—on the ground that a year is needed to demonstrate eligibility—for restricting players to four years, and for limiting the numbers of sports in which they participate. These rules tend to prevent the drafting of secondary school athletes, the theft of stars from other colleges, and various evils of excess, but their main function is that of necessitating scholarship as a condition of play. That the college should be “represented” by individuals who are not genuine students is intolerable, and it is to the credit of faculties that in the face of obstacles they persistently try to prevent it.⁷

The regulative duty of the student body is that of securing fair play. The players are their representatives, the sport is their sport, the spirit of the thing is supposed to be honest, good humored and chivalrous. No regulation by superior authorities can maintain the proper spirit unless it is supported by student sentiment. The desire for victory must be subordinated to higher motives in the undergraduate mind. In particular there are three distinct possibilities of improvement. In the first place, they can see to it that athletic representatives are genuinely representative of themselves, and this signifies that players are not clandestinely paid for playing, and that their general behavior is reputable. They are disgraced by the athletic sneak and the athletic tough who play in their name, whether or not victory results. Second, they can discountenance unfair tactics on the field. If a college represen-

⁷ The difficulty of enforcing requirements of scholarship is much greater than many critics suppose. In addition to ordinary pedagogical difficulties, such as large classes and the impossibility of preventing dishonesty, the instructor sometimes has to face the adverse influence of an administration inclined to favor loose conditions, and a vociferous student and alumni sentiment which resents any interference with the efficiency of teams. It is hard to discriminate between legitimate and illegitimate excuses for failure to comply with requirements. Cases of delinquency are often uncomfortably close to the line, for example, the indispensable pitcher whose percentage in trigonometry is fifty-nine, or the half-back who is short some thirty pages of collateral reading. What is just in such instances is not always clear.

tative cuts a base because the umpire isn't looking, or deliberately makes a foul tackle, or elbows a competitor in a sprint, he deserves a sharp rebuke, hissing from the grandstand or a formal protest in the college paper. On occasion every power of the college press, of student meetings, of incidental conversation at college commons and in fraternity houses, ought to be brought to bear to correct abuses and secure fair play. For it is a fundamental point, about which there must be no quibbling, that college sport must be clean.

The ordinary undergraduate sentiment about existing evils is that they are exceptional, or unimportant, or justified by common practice. "Others do these things and we must" is the familiar excuse. But this ignores a most important fact—the college is the seat of freedom, the place essentially fitted to advocate and initiate reform. Where if not in the college may we expect that a question shall be considered on its merits, and an abuse eliminated because it is wrong? College education is radically defective unless it develops a judicial, unprejudiced habit of mind which takes action in the right direction whether others do or not. The ideal of playing a game with the utmost fairness, of desiring to win but preferring to lose honorably rather than win dishonorably, of rebuking unfairness wherever it appears, this is surely no chimerical ideal for the college to cultivate.

The most effective regulation, therefore, proceeds along these three lines: sound financial method, including mature oversight and publicity; the definition of eligibility in terms of scholarship, and the cultivation of the sentiment of fair play. These conditions are gradually being attained; the process of eliminating evil practices is actually going on.

Professionalism

Intercollegiate athletics, as we have seen, have frequently run into professionalism, in fact professionalism in college sport is a kind of *bête noir*, always shunned, but always showing its head or tail on the field and in the newspapers. Not that the thing itself is bad. There is

certainly nothing essentially disgraceful in receiving money for athletic performances, or even in earning a livelihood by such talent. The significance of the distinction between professional and amateur sport is simply that the former monopolizes effort, involves more persistent and systematic training, and is usually more addicted to bad habits and manners—ruthlessness, trickery, unscrupulous readiness to take advantage of an opponent, and so on. The amateur is supposed to play for fun and to conduct himself as a gentleman. Though the distinction is far from clear or reliable, it signalizes an important truth—that sport is most likely to be honorable when there is nothing at stake but honor. Accordingly it appears desirable to conduct college athletics strictly on an amateur basis.

The difficulty of doing this, however, is very great, and the vexatiousness of the problem arises in part from the fact that the proper application of the terms amateur and professional is not clear. There are various kinds of reward for services, and no sharp line between those which are legitimate and those which are not. It is professional, of course, to accept money for playing, but not so to accept medals or cups; yet the latter have a money value, and are sometimes sold for cash. It is wrong to award a scholarship or give free board at a training table merely because of athletic proficiency; but suppose the recipient to be a fellow who deserves the scholarship on other grounds, or who pays all he can afford for board which costs much more—is he then an amateur? Uniforms are perhaps reasonably regarded as accessories of the game to which the player is entitled; but does the same category include expensive sweaters, blankets, and mementos of the season? And what about travelling expenses and luxurious hotel accommodations? These are not pay in the narrow meaning of the term, but they constitute rewards which are not simply honor, and which serve as motives for participation. Apparently college athletics cannot be conducted without expenses so large that the bills must be paid by persons other than the participants; but this inevitably raises puzzling questions concerning proper and improper emoluments.

Secondly, covert professionalism cannot be detected. Direct or indirect payment for playing summer baseball is beyond control, and there is also occasional participation in other sports for money, and paid coaching of school athletics, all of which goes under cover of an assumed name or other conditions which are "safe." Even more insidious is the indirect payment for athletic services. Undeserved scholarships are distributed, bills for room rent are never presented to the occupant, board bills are cancelled, fictitious wagers are won, worthless articles are sold for high prices, and the like. Competent athletes have been munificently rewarded for the burdensome labor of winding a clock, presumably of the eight day kind, and for strolling around the athletic field to assure the management that the fences needed no repairing. Clever players have often been entirely supported by wealthy alumni, ostensibly on philanthropic grounds. Concealment of pecuniary transactions has become a fine art, and prevarication a fixed custom. Against this sort of evasion neither pledges of honor nor available detective skill are effective. The parties to the surreptitious business are often the only ones who have the evidence, and while each of two competing teams may be aware of each other's professionalism it would be regarded as highly dishonorable as well as manifestly injudicious to reveal the facts. College athletes live in houses of glass—and throw no stones.

The condition which confronts us, then is this. Strictly amateur sport, in which the participant plays for fun and pays his own expenses, hardly exists in intercollegiate athletics; the latter are expensively supported by the spectators, and are permeated by a desire of winning rather than by a love of playing. On the other hand professionalism of the flagrant sort is outlawed; individual performance for pay is not permitted if it can be helped. Between these extremes lies the actual state of affairs, complex and puzzling. It is not amateur sport, even though it pretends to be; it is not professional sport, even though it includes a considerable amount of covert professionalism. Ought we to tolerate it, to try to define it satisfactorily, to regard it as approximately the solution

of the problem? Or ought we to make an end of its intricacies of "eligibility" and perhaps also of its elaborate organization and huge expensiveness?

It is sometimes proposed that colleges abandon the troublesome distinction between amateur and professional athletes, and insist simply that a player who represents it shall be a genuine student; in good college standing, and unpaid by any college agency. This, it is said, would largely remove the temptation to prevaricate, and if reinforced by financial publicity and by the exclusion of first year students from varsity teams, would not involve a lowering of the moral tone of the sport. The amount of professional spirit thus introduced into college games would not constitute a serious problem; bad habits, bad manners, the win-at-any-cost motive would not appear conspicuously greater than at present. I believe this to be true. College athletics need nothing more than proper publicity and clear evidence of seriousness of student purpose. The principal reforms have been made along these lines. But conditions are still far from satisfactory; too often the athlete is not studious, and the financial management is shrewdly unscrupulous. Until better conditions are assured it is doubtful whether we ought to abandon present safeguards.

CHAPTER XVIII

FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES

Origin and Development

The causes of fraternity and sorority organization are found in certain instincts of human nature, particularly the "group instinct" of flocking together upon a basis of common sympathies and purposes, the instinct of secrecy, which seeks to protect intimate personal affairs from the gaze of the outer world, and of course the universal tendency to imitation. Everywhere in society, in all stages of civilization, these instincts may be observed at work. They have created manifold secret societies, patriotic, industrial, social and religious, some of them huge in size and power. They are usually idealistic in motive, and this is especially true of college fraternities. Nothing could be more admirable than the moral aims proposed by their founders. The Constitution of the United States is hardly more dignified than the utterance of young men in forming a fraternity. Ritual, motto, grip, and badges, though intrinsically unimportant, are zealously guarded as symbols of personal and social idealism.

College and university life has always produced special groupings of students. The "nations" of the early European universities are a historic illustration. In the colonial colleges literary and debating societies played a noteworthy part, and the modern fraternity is in some sense an outgrowth of these. The first "Greek letter" society was Phi Beta Kappa, which was founded in 1776 at the College of William and Mary by a group of earnest souls who desired to express in concrete form their ideals of friendship, scholarship and patriotism. As a parent body it authorized the establishment of "chapters" at Yale, Har-

vard and Dartmouth and other colleges. After some years, however, it renounced its secret character and became distinctly a scholarly and honorary organization. Others appeared in the early part of the nineteenth century; between 1820 and 1830 three originated at Union College, and thereafter fraternity and chapter origins were frequent. The extension of higher education to women led to the formation of sororities, the first one of national scope being Kappa Alpha Theta, which was organized at De Pauw in 1870.¹

The development of college fraternities may be divided into two periods. During the first, which continued through most of the last century they were simply societies of kindred spirits, holding regular meetings for literary and social purposes in unpretentious lodge rooms, having unimportant secrets, and binding members together by strong ties of friendship and common activity. At first there was opposition to them, both within and without the college walls. College authorities and the interested public feared the growth of irresponsible power, or suspected the perpetration of immoral practices. Other students often resented being left outside the fold. In general, however, the societies maintained themselves in the face of opposition. When discountenanced or suppressed they lurked on in deeper secrecy or gave way to other types of organization. In time the opposition waned and they gained a recognized place in college life.

The second stage of development covers the last thirty or forty years. It is characterized by the increasingly dominant influence of fraternity interests in the life of members, and by the "fraternity house" as a college home. In this period, also, certain menacing features appeared, particularly social exclusiveness and distraction from study. Signs of a third period are distinctly visible, however, since

¹In some institutions, notably Harvard, Yale, Princeton, the older colleges for women, and many of the small colleges, fraternities and sororities, either do not exist, or else play an insignificant part in college life. State legislatures have occasionally outlawed them from state universities, and the women's colleges have in several instances deliberately given them up. As a rule their place is taken by clubs constituted on other principles.

the unmistakably bad effects upon individual members and upon the college dispose all parties to eliminate the evils and to make the fraternity instrumental to the general welfare.

There are at present some thirty-three college fraternities and seventeen college sororities having a general or national organization, beside fifty or more professional and technical school fraternities which have no college chapters. In addition there are many "local fraternities" existing in single institutions. The national bodies publish magazines containing fraternity and college news, and their conventions are often made impressive by the presence of distinguished leaders of public affairs.

The total membership, alumni and undergraduate, is about three hundred thousand. Fraternity organization, in fact, enrolls approximately half the college students in the country, though the percentage varies greatly in different institutions. The character of the membership is for the most part admirable. The alumni ranks include presidents, judges of the Supreme Court, senators and representatives, dignitaries of the church, and distinguished captains of industrial and commercial life. Undergraduate chapters contain a large proportion of the ablest students in the college, those having broad interests and superior mental ability. There is in general a praiseworthy desire to develop a rounded character by choosing for associates men of varied interests, representative of different aspects of college life; fraternities are well aware that an intercollegiate debater, a half back and the editor of the college paper may possess a common good fellowship. On the other hand the character of a chapter tends to become fixed by a process of instinctive selection which draws into its ranks those who possess certain agreeable qualifications. Thus certain groups are characterized by scholarship, by wealth, by social activity, and sometimes by worse traits.

The current period of fraternity development is characterized by the fraternity house. About half the total number of college chapters have dwellings which they have rented, bought or built for their own purposes. These are in some instances an outgrowth of a compact

dormitory life. In colleges without dormitories, and particularly in the state universities, the fraternity house has come almost by necessity, being decidedly preferable to isolated and perhaps neglected rooms in lodging houses. The more luxurious dwellings, sometimes costing from fifty to a hundred thousand dollars, provide the expensive appurtenances of club life. Occasionally they are financial incubi, constant sources of debt or burdens to loyal alumni. The fraternity house is also the source of many administrative problems which trouble college authorities.

The Value of the Fraternity

The fundamental advantage of the fraternity is that it constitutes a college home. The term has deep significance. Broadly speaking, home life is by far the most effective system of social and moral education; in respect to essentials of character almost everybody is what his home has made him. On entering college, however, one usually passes beyond the immediate range of these home influences. Neither the populous dormitory nor the solitary "furnished room to let" is homelike. If the student is mature or self dependent he gets along well enough, except perhaps for occasional loneliness or the loss of some refining influences. But for many the situation is unhappy, and precisely here the fraternity often proves helpful. It may provide living accommodations better than those of dormitory or boarding house—many fraternities show superior refinement in their material advantages; but in any case it enmeshes every member with a network of personal relations. They are friendships, and more; they deserve the name of "brotherhood." They may be and often are like the relations within a well regulated family, sympathetic, mutually helpful, lifelong. Returning alumni enter the fraternity house as they would reenter their own homes, and become at once, simply and unaffectedly, the big brothers of "the boys." Visiting members of other chapters are received with the unpretentious hospitality of kinsfolk. Indeed, wherever the wayfarer finds a group of college youth wearing his own mystic letters he is assured of being "at home."

Out of this material comfort and personal intimacy grows another advantage, namely "individual training." The freshman, descending from his exalted position as a desirable candidate and from the solemn ceremony of initiation, finds himself a humble servant of the common weal. Broom, coal shovel and lawn mower round off obtrusive corners of individuality. If he is lazy or refractory he is appropriately disciplined. If he needs polish, acquaintance with social usages and conventionalities, he may acquire these more easily from fraternal example than from the casual associations of dormitory or commons. If he flounders in studies, perhaps receiving little personal attention from instructors, older brethren can help him, making themselves tutors and giving detailed instruction such as the teacher of hundreds cannot give. Thus in a variety of ways the unfledged youngster may learn to use his own powers in his college home.

Fraternity life also gives valuable training in administrative affairs, since the offices of president, chairman, treasurer, steward, committee member, delegate, and the like, all call for skill in dealing with men and things. Practical responsibility is a most efficient school, and the task of engineering a fraternity may help to prepare one for managing the business of a corporation. The regular business meetings of the chapter give helpful training.²

² Some of the best parliamentary procedure I have seen was that of a certain fraternity. Regular business, special business, committee reports and assignments, all flowed by smoothly and swiftly, with orderly waves of open debate. The visitor found himself thinking, "Oh, that faculty meetings might proceed likewise!" Perhaps the presiding officer's combination of college experience, intense vigor and dark red hair had something to do with the matter. He was a youth who was destined to make things go, and I have no doubt that in larger ways he is doing it still.

In this connection I may mention an odd custom of the same fraternity called "the stool." When business affairs had come to an end, a chair was placed in front and upon this a member designated by the chairman took his seat, facing his brethren, who proceeded to criticize him with a frankness that was startling. Approbation and reproof were judiciously blended. Cheerful disposition and lazy habit received their just dues. The humbled brother grinned uncomfortably, but bore the pungent remarks

A third advantage of fraternity organization is found in the opportunity for service to the college. The fraternity can encourage and support college enterprises, athletic, musical, literary. It can take a vigorous and at the same time honest part in college politics, rising above partisanship and casting its votes for those who are best qualified to administer student affairs. It can hold the unstudious to their duties; in fact many fraternities have been led to see that an attitude of indifference to scholarship is bad for the fraternity itself, and have instituted systematic efforts to maintain creditable standing, securing information with regard to delinquent members, and prodding or prying them out of their slothful rut. In matters of college honor it can cooperate with college authorities in holding individuals to high standards and bringing offenders to justice. In these and other ways it can make its strength of organization instrumental to the college welfare, and thus attain a higher individuality of its own. Fortunately the fraternities are actually gaining this wider vision of service.

Fraternity Evils

The fraternity has its darker side, however, and this is usually the outside. The benefits are most apparent to those within; the evils are more conspicuous to college authorities and to the surrounding community.

In the first place it is universally acknowledged that the current practices of "rushing" and pledging candidates in the opening weeks of the college year are bad. Sometimes the incoming student hardly sets foot upon the campus before he falls into the hands of fraternity scouts. The latter even accost him at the depot or board his train at a distance in order to obtain a preliminary survey of a possible candidate. Thereafter the hapless wight is continuously rushed through a succession of social affairs which hardly allow him time for sleep, to say nothing of study. Fraternity committees may parcel out his hours without ill temper. I was assured that the practice had proved itself a salutary method of social discipline. It was family frankness with formal decorum and no spite.

among themselves, one party promptly taking charge of him when the allotted time of its predecessor has expired. For days and nights the freshman hears little beside fraternity talk. Similarly in the case of sorority women there is an incessant round of social affairs. A dozen or more luncheons, dinners, picnics and parties are thought necessary to maintain an attractive social front. That this sort of thing is a bad start in the college year is perfectly clear. For the freshman it is not only an interference with work, but it strongly suggests that a college course is a huge social function; and though he is undeceived later he retains the feeling that fraternity affairs have a rightful dominance over other college interests. For upper classmen likewise the effort is one of unwholesome distraction from college work, and occasionally of bitter competition with rival fraternities, in which the larger unities of college life are entirely ignored. All parties begin the year wrong.

The result of this haste is sometimes serious misjudgment on both sides. The fraternity does not have time to determine whether a candidate really possesses the requisite qualities of character. If he is well behaved, has a genial manner, presents a good appearance, and is likely to fall into the clutches of another fraternity, he receives a "bid," and in consequence the group discovers that it has acquired a burden under which it must labor for years; or an initiate finds himself in a group which is thoroughly uncongenial. Entertainers and entertained have been on their best behavior, and have not displayed the habitual nature which is the only proper basis of choice. The fact that such misfits are so few, and that all parties usually try to make the best of the matter, does not extenuate the badness of the method of selection.³

³The new companionships are sometimes demoralizing in the extreme. Boys find themselves engulfed in the vortex of a wild life from which they cannot escape. At the worst the fraternity house has been a sink of iniquity. For the most part, however, the fraternity diversions are not vicious; comparatively little immorality in college can be charged to fraternity organization. More commonly the evil is the loss of educational purpose, and the easy, good-natured drifting into a round of social activities.

Fraternity life interferes with study. There are fraternities, it is true, which have made a distinguished record in scholarship, but the general level has been unscholarly. Statistics show clearly that there is a larger percentage of failure and of low grades among fraternity than among non-fraternity students. This fact is the more significant if, as some critics think, the former possess superior natural ability.

The causes of this condition are found, of course, in the social distractions of fraternity life, and particularly in these which characterize the fraternity house. A friend drops in with some interesting news. Another friend begins to bang the piano and three more attempt to sing. A fourth hand is needed at whist. The committee on something or other must hold a meeting; and so on. The many social affairs require planning; they also invite much conversational waste of time, anticipatory and retrospective. The fundamental difficulty, however, is not the actual monopoly of time by social functions, but rather the distraction of interest. As one's time is not acknowledged to be one's own, and all sorts of good natured interruptions are frequent, educational earnestness gradually yields to the habit of good fellowship. In the case of sorority women the social excitement is sometimes so sustained as to interfere with health and produce a nervous or exhausted condition in which study is impossible.

Much current criticism of fraternities and sororities alleges a pernicious separation from the life and ideals of the college. Their purposes, interests and habits, it is pointed out, are divisive rather than cooperative. Whereas there ought to be a constant community interest on the part of all, the fraternity organization tends to replace this with the interests of an exclusive circle; it breaks up the living organism of the college into fractious and troublesome parts. The evils are increased by fraternity residence off the campus, since the fraternity house is self sufficient and becomes unregardful of the college at large. The little group stands aloof, contented with its own society. It makes laws for itself and obeys few others. Or, if it takes part in the life of the college it

does so in partisan fashion, pulling and hauling against other fraternities in matters of college government. By working political deals with its opponents it nominates its own members for college offices, often without regard for competency, and succeeds in electing them. The glorification of the fraternity is the dominant motive; the elders in the group preach the doctrine of "fraternity first" to younger members. Occasionally there is concerted opposition to college authority. The organization systematizes dishonesty in class work and examinations, shields offenders from detection and penalty, stands solidly by the culprit with a loyalty worthy of a better cause.⁴

It is a frequent accusation that the fraternity is "undemocratic." The term is used in a social rather than in a political sense, however; it signifies a self appointed aristocracy, essentially snobbish in its attitude toward non-fraternity students. The privilege of selecting one's associates is of course unquestionable, but when social exclusiveness is carried to the point of refusing to recognize other students it becomes intolerable. Many critics feel that the very nature of fraternity organization is incompatible with the general freedom and equality which should characterize student life.

Regulation

The attitude of college authorities toward Greek letter societies was for some time, and in certain colleges still is, that of opposition. Presidents, faculties, trustees and even state legislatures have suppressed them by personal mandate or prohibitory enactment. Historically, however, they have usually overcome such opposition, and on the whole the repressive policy may be said to have failed. The natural law according to which large groups sub-

⁴ An illustrative case is that of the behavior of a sorority, one of whose members was suspended. In accordance with the rule governing such offences, she was forbidden to enter the college buildings; nevertheless, her sisters repeatedly entertained her in their rooms, and at length took her to dinner in the college dining hall. It required the suspension of a large part of the chapter to make it clear that the law was to be obeyed.

divide into small ones, and the underlying disposition to seek congenial society, inevitably bring substitutes for the outlawed fraternities, substitutes which are in some cases quite as objectionable in point of secrecy and exclusiveness.⁵

The proper administrative attitude is not that of indifference, however. Through most of their history college authorities have regarded fraternities as student affairs of the kind which are wisely left to student control. But this attitude is no longer safe. Fraternities have assumed such a central position in college life as to demand official attention. With all their advantages they are unmistakably the seat of numerous evils. The fraternity house, in particular, inevitably creates problems for the college administration. Simply to ignore these and let the organizations alone is therefore virtually to sanction unwholesome conditions.

The proper attitude, therefore, is that of cooperative regulation. Fraternities as a rule are not only desirous of maintaining the college welfare—full of “college spirit” according to their somewhat imperfect lights—but are also aware of their defects and ready to participate in reform. Though they fear individually to undertake restrictive innovations and display an independence which rebels against arbitrary or dictatorial treatment, they nevertheless take kindly to sympathetic assistance, and are ready to accept wise guidance. Their large power as instruments of college welfare makes it desirable to take advantage of this cooperative spirit.

A policy of cooperative regulation implies that the common problems of the fraternities, especially those which involve relation to the college administration, should be settled by a committee of representatives of the several groups, acting with faculty assistance or faculty sanction. Such a

⁵In most of the prominent colleges for women sororities have been suppressed or radically modified, usually, I think, as a check to social exclusiveness. Some one has said that whereas a fraternity is a closed circle of men facing outward, a sorority is a circle facing inward. Certainly, the two bodies do not present the same problem. It is too soon, however, to say with assurance whether the prohibition is effective.

body can make rules for rushing, pledging, and initiation, for the control of social functions, and for conduct in house or dormitory. It can replace mutual antagonism, reckless competition and underhanded self seeking, by harmonious action for the welfare of all concerned. Its very importance and responsibility tend to insure wisdom of action.

Apart from such joint action the individual fraternity may cooperate with the college administration by assuring itself that initiates are in good college standing, neither deficient in studies nor subject to college discipline. It may also maintain a creditable standard of scholarship by bringing pressure upon delinquent members. In some cases it is desirable that an alumnus or faculty friend be given supervisory authority within the chapter. Such an elder brother will offer needful advice, keep a watchful eye upon finances to avoid disgraceful debts, and in general give the fraternity the benefit of his mature experience and thorough perspective of college life.⁶

In the Greek letter society as in other human institutions—and in human character generally—the good and the bad are very much mixed. Whether the good outweighs the bad, whether there is a net benefit or a net loss, is a question which is differently answered by experienced college observers. Of three facts, however, we may be sure: first, the fraternity is here to stay; second, it has large potency for good in the life of the college as well as that of its members; third, it needs firm, systematic and sympathetic regulation.

By way of postscript let us note the danger that fraternity membership will be deemed a more important feature of college life than it really is. At least fifty per cent of the college students of the country do not belong either to national or to local societies. Some do not desire membership, some are not desired as associates, some

⁶Some fraternities have found it practicable to employ a national secretary, on salary, who visits all the chapters, scrutinizes affairs in a friendly way, and, if necessary, consults with the college authorities in regard to regulation.

cannot afford the expense of fraternity life. In general these non-fraternity students get along very well, perhaps quite as well on the whole as do the members of fraternities. While there are a few who are rendered unhappy by being left out of the mystic circles, most take their lot as a matter of course, and are too healthy minded to lament it. On occasion non-fraternity students find it possible to unite both for political and for social purposes. It is well to remember that Greek letter societies, after all, are only highly complex instruments of friendship and service. Any one who desires to serve may do so; any one who deserves friends is likely to win them, without as well as within the fraternity circle.

CHAPTER XIX

COLLEGE RELIGION

The Religious Character of the College

The American college has always conducted its work in the name of, or at least in sympathy with religion. At the outset, as we have seen, its religious motives were thoroughly ingrained, permeating both its curriculum and its daily life. To inculcate the true Christian faith was, as many a college charter shows, a primary object of its foundation.

Of course this early doctrinal piety and narrow sectarianism necessarily gave way to more liberal views. As the surrounding culture developed the curriculum gained breadth and independence; living acquired a more secular character; and while certain formal requirements remained, particularly that of daily attendance at chapel, the general tendency was away from an authoritative propagation of religion. Certain colleges, as Williams, explicitly announced their religious freedom, and state universities often found that the safest attitude toward conflicting creeds was indifference to all.¹ The percentage of graduates entering the ministry declined. Now and then waves of free thinking appeared, and atheistic books received more eager perusal than authorized texts. It is reported that at Yale and Princeton at the beginning of the nineteenth century hardly a handful of students professed Christianity. The passing decades show some antagonism and more indifference to religion.²

Nevertheless the college atmosphere has usually been

¹ Even in colonial times we find evidence of this. The charter of Brown University contains provisions expressly intended to maintain religious freedom.

² See Thwing, *History of Higher Education in America*, p. 381.

charged with religious interest. Some denominational colleges have continued the early tradition, prescribing Bible study and exercising a prayerful watchfulness over the lives of students. Many have resorted to "revivals" from time to time in order to evoke religious zeal. Almost all have cultivated religious interest in the form of student organizations, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations and a score of smaller societies, all of which are constantly striving to deepen the spiritual currents of student life. Under their auspices Bible study has become popular, sometimes to the extent of enrolling a large majority of the student body in regular classes.³ Though the custom of opening curricular class hours with prayer has all but disappeared, the spirit of instruction is uniformly reverent. College teachers worship a God of Truth.

It is therefore a mistake to suppose that the college is less religious than formerly. Rather is it equally religious in a new way. Whatever its loss of doctrinal teaching and formal practice, this is overbalanced by new forces of organized service, by improved instruction in the history and philosophy of religion, and especially by the development of breadth and earnestness in the student mind. Religion has become less a matter of verbal profession and formal worship than of eager aspiration, warm sympathy and practical helpfulness. Though the college output into the ministry has shrunk to small proportions, the number of college students and graduates enrolled in the wider ministry of everyday Christian life and service is probably quite as great proportionally as it has ever been. Critics who accuse the college of being essentially indifferent or hostile to religion, who regard it as a place where study and environment breed skeptics and atheists, do not understand its real character. Its dominant forces are forces of faith and righteousness. It never has been and probably

³Of course this interest is in some cases superficial and transitory. The classes "peter out" under pressure of other college affairs. Yet the initial fact remains significant of respect for religion and a desire to become acquainted with the spirit and teachings of Christianity.

never can be completely or essentially secularized. The very seriousness of its educational purpose tends to give it a religious atmosphere. Hence in the proper meaning of the term the college is still a religious institution.

College Chapel

The central feature of the religious life of the college is the chapel service. Few colleges fail to conduct religious worship daily, and in most, with the exception of certain state universities, regular attendance is required. The character of the service varies widely, however. Sometimes it is almost ideal in reverence and beauty; sometimes it is utterly lacking in earnestness—a mere liturgical routine, spiritually defunct; and sometimes it is afflicted by expressions of indifference or contempt—from the visitors gallery one sees newspapers and notebooks, hears a steady buzz of whispered conversation, and feels the restless impatience with the mechanical ceremony. Often the convenience of the gathering leads to the introduction of non-religious matters, so that the solemnity of the occasion is lightened by humorous announcements, and the service of worship passes easily into a football rally. In all cases, however, chapel is the religious center of the college; the daily worship is its “family prayers.”

The benefits of the chapel service are mainly two. In the first place it affords genuine spiritual help to many students. The quiet quarter hour at the beginning of the day, the inspiration of song and prayer, the wisdom of a brief talk on the more serious aspects of college life, all this has a steadying power for one who puts himself within reach of it. Multitudes of students have testified that chapel seems “to begin the day right.” The psychologist of religion knows that life needs some such periodical retreat from its busy enterprises and nervous strain, some occasional moments of thoughtfulness about higher things. Communion with the realm of ideals brings steadiness of aim and an influx of strength, powers which are nowhere more needful than in college life.

Second, the chapel has extraordinary social value. It calls the college family together and reminds the members

that they belong together. It produces that peculiar feeling of unity which is essential to college spirit. The words addressed to all alike, the common participation in the form of worship, even the mere physical proximity, serve to suppress differences of sentiment and to heighten the sense of brotherhood. From time immemorial groups of people in tribe, household, village, and town have deepened their community of interest by making it religious; the common need has everywhere received expression in religious assembly. Accordingly we find the college authorities and the more thoughtful members of college communities almost uniformly of this opinion: the spiritual unity and welfare of the college depend in no small degree upon the daily chapel service.

On the other hand chapel attendance is likely to prove inconvenient to many persons. When the bell rings there are often other things that call, seemingly more important or at least more inviting than the repetition of a perfectly familiar form of service. Those last moments of preparation for a written exercise, for example, are so precious! If the assembly precedes the day's business it may interfere with comfort in ways too obvious to need specification, and while some of these, such as the late breakfast, are hardly worth consideration, others like a settled habit of study or distance of residence should not be disregarded. The inconvenience to members of the faculty is clearly shown by their infrequent attendance except under compulsion; wherefore the student is likely to feel that his own inconvenience is equally genuine.

But a more serious objection is that compulsory attendance is inconsistent with religious freedom and with the spirit of religion. How deeply this sentiment of liberty is ingrained in our national consciousness and individual thinking we all know. The imposition of religious worship upon those who are opposed or indifferent to it, or whose faith may practise another form of expression, seems radically wrong. College teachers as well as college students are of this opinion, and in some instances the force of opposition has succeeded in abolishing the requirement.

Voluntary chapel attendance, however, can hardly be regarded as a successful solution of the problem. Under the most favorable conditions of brevity, beautiful music, and helpful addresses upon topics of student life, it fails to attract more than a fraction, sometimes an absurdly small fraction, of the student body. Competing interests exercise too strong a pressure. Even with appreciation and good intentions the line of least resistance is all too likely to lead elsewhere than to the chapel door. Generally speaking, to remove the requirement is virtually to abolish chapel as a function of the whole college.

The importance of this is that it signifies a loss of social unity. No other agency, such as college newspaper, occasional mass meetings, or athletic sports, serves as does the chapel service to sustain the common enthusiasm of college life. Students are often aware of this. At Yale the senior class has for several years voted annually in favor of compulsory attendance, and at Lehigh a brief experience with "voluntary chapel" was terminated by a student petition for a restoration of the requirement.

Yet the internal condition of many a college chapel service is so unsatisfactory as to demand change. What principles of improvement can we indicate? In answer the writer ventures to make three suggestions. First, if the service follows a routine liturgical form—which inevitably becomes perfunctory and monotonous—it should be vitalized by short talks on points of college interest, problems of student life, more general matters of educational importance, and the like. These should come not only from president and dean, but from other members of the faculty, all of whom, by the way, should take pains to present what they have to say in five to ten minutes. Second, on one or more days of the week the religious service should be replaced by a program devoted to secular interests, with appropriate speeches and the college songs. This would give these interests a forum such as they usually lack, and by leaving the chapel service distinctly religious it would prevent the painful descent from the Lord's Prayer to the college yell which sometimes characterizes college worship. Third, the matter of requiring attendance should

be turned over to the students themselves. If they believe that the daily meeting is instrumental to the college welfare it is for them not only to come, but to see that others come. If it were understood that the college office in requiring attendance and the chapel leaders in conducting the service were simply the servants of the body politic, the spirit of the gathering would be changed. Resentment would be lessened, and offences would be dealt with as they deserved.

In any case this fact should be taken to heart. The chapel service is organically a part of a well regulated college. It contains potentialities of much helpfulness in student life, individual and social. It will be just as valuable as those who participate in it choose to make it.

The True Faith

An almost inevitable consequence of experiencing the new conditions of college life is that the student suffers some change of religious sentiment or belief. One who comes from a pious home or from a church which imposes unquestioning acceptance of the literal word of religious tradition, finds that higher education presents a new view of the universe and of human duty. On the other hand, one who enters with indifference to religion may learn that as a scholar he cannot ignore its power in history and in contemporary life. So there comes a change of view, perhaps development and enrichment, perhaps doubt and loss of faith, in consequence of breathing the college atmosphere.

In some cases this change is profoundly painful. A state of doubt or disbelief sets in which reaches down into the depths of one's nature, and which brings with it temporary or permanent distress. Ordinarily this experience is transitory—a natural disturbance preceding a new equilibrium—but sometimes it is more lasting, and the man or woman walks through life in its shadow. Just because religion is so fundamental in our nature there is no struggle more intense and no depression more profound than that which takes place when old faith is shaken by new forces of education.

Those who best understand the conditions of college life know that its dominating influences do not make against religion, but rather for it. Yet it cannot be denied that certain almost universal factors tend to produce a radical disturbance and change. The most important of these factors are the new views, scientific, historical and philosophic, which college study impresses upon the student. A vastly larger universe spreads before him, a universe of long evolution according to natural laws, a universe in which God seems far away. The sense of personal relation to a Heavenly Father fades into a cheerless feeling of being an infinitely insignificant cog in the universal mechanism. Religion itself is seen to be a product of slow evolution, full of absurdities, superstition and cruelty; and many of its contemporary manifestations are obviously crude survivals of outgrown fear and fancy. If, as is too frequently the case, the student has come to college without a sound basis of religious instruction, or if he has brought with him ideas which are hopelessly out of keeping with the assured results of modern study, he can hardly escape an internal struggle. In some instances it is true, however harsh the truth may sound, that he not only is shaken, but ought to be—until the nonsense and bigotry are shaken out of him.

Together with this expansion of intellectual vision there comes an impression from the example of persons who are, or at least appear to be, non-religious. Some of these are highly educated associates, men of culture and charm; some are friendly fellow students, glib expounders of irreligion. Polite atheism and agnosticism flourish in certain college precincts, and the newcomer is haunted by an uncomfortable suspicion that his former religious instructors were less trustworthy than he supposed—that they did not know so much as they pretended. Apparently life may be lived quite as happily, in fact rather more so, without religious professions. In some minds the feeling of courageous rebellion against religious commands and prohibitions has its own peculiar agreeableness.

Both of these factors may gain strength from the student's loss of practical connection with a church. Without

the steadying power of religious associations, of worship and service, the problem becomes purely intellectual, and in this field often seems hopeless.

What is the solution of the problem, the remedy for a condition so manifestly unsatisfactory? In so far as the difficulty is intellectual—and it usually is largely a matter of doubt, of uncertainty about principles of life, of dissatisfaction with familiar creeds and inability to construct new ones—there is no remedy except that which essentially characterizes the college, namely study. As the trouble comes through the direct and indirect teaching provided by the institution, so it must be met. One who has lost his religious footing can regain it only by discovering the true nature of religion, its sound articles of belief, its place in history, its dynamic power in society, and its inestimable value in personal life. If religion cannot demonstrate its truth and worth in this way it can hardly escape rejection by thinking people. The study may be pursued in college classes, or by private reading of wisely chosen books, or as conversation with friends, but the needful attainment in any case is a new and better view of the truth. Perhaps, indeed, the doubt is valuable just because it leads to a firmer assurance.

Certainly the effort to reestablish oneself pays. There is no subject in the whole curriculum which better deserves study, or which rewards the student more bountifully, than religion. One who comes to understand it gains a new respect for it, a new assurance of faith, and a new conviction of the duty of mankind and his own duty. The serious effort to put oneself abreast of the best modern religious thought is sure to succeed, both in its acquisition of ideas and in its effect upon life.⁴

At the same time there is vital need of practical activity as well as of intellectual study, of doing as well as of thinking. For this reason it is well to continue one's familiar practices of worship—there is no real insincerity

⁴I believe that there is no subject better entitled to recognition as an indispensable part of a "liberal education" than the study of Christianity, its sources, origin and development, fundamental teachings and application to contemporary problems.

in such an act of faith, unless, of course, one has passed beyond doubt to a condition of positive disbelief—to continue also the sane regulation of daily life, and especially to make an effort to help those who seem to need help wherever we find them. Religion consists essentially of a feeling of relation to a higher power which is the source of our common humanity, and of a constant effort to live according to this faith. It is desirable that the feeling should take an intelligent form—indeed it instinctively tends to assume this—but it is no less important that we should support the feeling, when new forces disturb it, by persisting in the right kind of conduct. With our modern psychological understanding of the matter we see that feeling and thought depend upon action quite as much as action follows from them. If college students would take part in some organized religious work such as is unquestionably worth doing in any case, there would be less inner disturbance and loss of faith.

Nevertheless the problem of what to believe is one which demands solution, and there is peculiar strength and comfort in the possession of a definite creed. What then shall we do if the ancient creeds seem unsatisfactory as expressions of the religious hope and faith and determination of to-day? There is but one thing to do—make a new one, that is to say, make our own. A college education surely ought to enable us to state what we really believe, and to act out that belief in our life. If we desire a powerful revelation of truth this is more likely to come through our own thoughtful experience than through ideas imposed upon us by external authority or accepted by sheer force of will.⁵ So long as our creed represents our profoundest convictions, reached by earnest, careful thinking we need not worry about its discrepancies from more widely accepted ones.

Of course the fact that we have attained a view satisfactory to ourselves does not imply that we ought to impose it upon others. Our well meant missionary efforts often

⁵ For a statement of several modernized forms of creed see Hyde, *The College Man and the College Woman*, Chap. VIII, *The Creed of a College Class*.

need stern self restraint. It is foolish to try to convert to our own way of thinking persons who have not followed or perhaps cannot follow our own way of study and reflection. In such cases it is usually best not to broach matters of religious doctrine at all. If they cannot or will not grasp new ideas thoughtfully, if they do not feel the problem as we feel it, they deserve to be left alone. Their own beliefs are probably better for them than a misunderstanding of ours. The possibility of a common Christian life, which after all is the most important part of religion, remains unaffected by differences of formal belief.⁶

Religion, we should remember, is not so much a special department of life as a kind of glow and enthusiasm diffused over all life. Religion is faith and hope and love; religion is earnest, joyous service of our fellow men; religion is a working conviction that the world is ruled by a power which makes for righteousness, which strengthens us in our living and which needs our help. To this view and practice of religion the American college is tending with ever increasing clearness and power.

* Especially ought the student to refrain from introducing religious disturbance into his family, not simply because it is unwise to attack the convictions of his elders, but also because it is better not to run the risk of shaking their faith in him. He can well afford simply to omit points of religious belief as subjects of conversation. There are plenty of other topics to talk about, and after all their daily lives are probably quite as good as his own.

APPENDIX A

THE OFFER OF THE COLLEGE

(Hyde, *The College Man and the College Woman*, p. 3)

“To be at home in all lands and all ages; to count Nature a familiar acquaintance, and Art an intimate friend; to gain a standard for the appreciation of other men’s work and the criticism of your own; to carry the keys of the world’s library in your pocket, and feel its resources behind you in whatever task you undertake; to make hosts of friends among the men of your own age who are to be leaders in all walks of life; to lose yourself in generous enthusiasms and cooperate with others for common ends; to learn manners from students who are gentlemen, and form character under professors who are Christians,—this is the offer of the college for the best four years of your life.”

APPENDIX B

CHOOSING A VOCATION

The problem of choosing a vocation depends so essentially upon circumstances and involves so many peculiarly individual factors that the considerations which can be briefly set down for the student's guidance are mostly of a common sense sort. The fact that common sense is not so commonly observed as might be, affords a sufficient reason for mentioning a few points.

Note first that the problem does not ordinarily solve itself unless you think about it. Such thinking ought not to be postponed until late in your course; it ought to be begun in your freshman year. "What am I good for? What would I like to do?"—these are questions which should be faced early and frequently. Simply to drift along thoughtlessly with the expectation or hope that something will turn up, or that an easy berth will be opened through family influence, is to court failure. On the other hand thinking does not mean hasty decision. Generally speaking, a freshman has not seen enough of the world or of human affairs to settle the matter with assurance. One who decides prematurely may make a serious mistake, in the prosecution of which he may further blind himself to the liberal education given by the college. The decision should ripen through a longer period of thoughtfulness.

There is perhaps a special danger of following the line of least resistance—further study in graduate or professional school—not from a real desire to become a lawyer or teacher, but because this course postpones the day of actually going to work, and continues the easy going type of life which has proved so agreeable during the college years. What many a college graduate needs is to get into the actual struggle of life upon graduation. And with this

warning goes another—against the seductiveness of the “black coated job.” You may need to go among men who do not wear black coats but who are really doing the world’s work. Experience of this sort may be needed to bring out the power, the resourcefulness, the ingenuity, and, last but not least, the sympathy which is latent in you. Yet if you have thoughtfully settled upon some professional aim, give yourself the most thorough training you can afford.

As far as possible, tentative proposals should be practically tested. If journalism looks attractive visit a newspaper office; if medicine, a hospital. Mere contact may bring the thrill which indicates a natural bent. In many lines it is possible to get some small job which will serve to show what you have to expect as a life work. In any case get all the information and the concrete acquaintance you can. If you can find books or articles about vocations in which you are interested, read them.

The professions of law and medicine are seriously overcrowded. In order to get a start in the first you may need influential connections; for the second, capital is almost indispensable. A large majority of lawyers work for a pittance or eke out their income in other ways. A majority of medical graduates never establish themselves in practice. Ability and courage are likely to win, of course, but the hardships of poverty and obscurity are not to be minimized. Professional positions in the ministry and in teaching are more easily attained, but for the most part are grievously underpaid. Yet many teachers and ministers find the intimate, sympathetic, helpful personal relationships which their professions involve a compensation for deficiencies in other respects.

Finally, the best promise lies in a readiness to do whatever you can, to do anything which lies within your powers. The college course by its very breadth, serves to fit a man or woman in a general way for various occupations. The essential requisite, after all, is a desire to work.

APPENDIX C

TWO VOCATIONAL AIMS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

There are two occupations into which many college graduates go, namely business and housekeeping. Higher education for these pursuits is possible and desirable, yet there are very few schools for the purpose. It is doubtful, indeed, whether advanced study for them should be confined to special schools; rather would it seem to be properly integrated with the college curriculum. If we believe that vocational and cultural training cannot be kept entirely apart, that cultural studies have vocational value and vocational studies cultural value; if we believe that general training for, as distinguished from particular training in, vocations is desirable—as it certainly is inevitable—in the college; if we understand the aim of the college to be that of giving higher education, so far as it can, for a well rounded life,—then we may hope to see college men and women, with increasing numbers and seriousness, preparing themselves for these occupations.

Already a large number of college graduates—in some institutions approaching fifty per cent.—enter some form of business. That some training for this is requisite follows from the fact that there is much criticism of them. It is acknowledged that they ultimately develop more than average efficiency, that their intelligence and independence really count in the long run; but it is charged that they lack serious purpose and “business sense,” and are slow in getting over their college habits. What is needed is not, of course, the arithmetic, stenography and typewriting of the “business college,” but an intelligent view of the nature and functions of business and a method of work which can be applied to its problems. Cannot the college and the student cooperate in higher education which shall make participation in commercial life more directly effective?

As regards many of the points of criticism—e. g. defective spelling and hand writing, inability to dictate a coherent letter, lack of punctuality, lack of systematic method, unwillingness to submit to necessary routine, and so on—the general methods of the curriculum, if properly applied, will suffice. In respect to the content of study there is need of development of the history of commerce, of the systematic study of its forms, problems and resources, of its interrelations with political and other aspects of modern civilization.¹ It is of the first importance, also, that college men in business should have developed an idealism above the ordinary conception of “success.” The desideratum is a point of view which regards business as instrumental to social welfare. It is interesting to think of the possible effect of an annual discharge into American business of a stream of active, clear minded young men animated by a desire to improve the economic conditions of society as well as to make a living. Critics of vocational training in the college usually hold that the desired training can be sufficiently acquired in actual business life. But in this matter no other agency compares with the college, with its broad curriculum and atmosphere of studious idealism. If college graduates are to be the best business men the college must help to make them so.

The college has a corresponding function with respect to women. Almost all will occupy positions which involve domestic management; married and unmarried alike will, in most cases, sooner or later direct a household. Furthermore, the home life of the community should be of especial interest to women, just as men should take interest in the commercial functions of society, whatever may be the extent of their direct participation in these. Accord-

¹“By sound methods he should investigate such subjects as these: the effects on business of gold and other standards of value; the effects of protective tariff and other tariffs; the results on commerce of friendly and unfriendly foreign relations; the relation of trade to the flag; the results, immediate and ultimate, of subsidies, trusts and bounties; the possibilities of railway control; the methods of dignified and economical local government; the question of municipal control; the meaning of civil service reform.” Jordan, *The Voice of the Scholar*, p. 130.

ingly women should have the opportunity to study sanitation, hygiene, domestic architecture, the cost and scientific preparation of food, the manufacture of fabrics and clothing, principles of decoration, and the like. It is the business of women to understand these subjects and to apply them in their own life. That they are instinctively inclined to do so is made clear by the numbers which flock to departments of "domestic science" in state universities and in other colleges where the matter is competently presented. No part of higher education is of greater promise for individual happiness and social welfare. The possible improvement of business by inoculating it with college idealism is not larger than the possible improvement of municipal cleanliness and health, of market honesty and household economy, by the attack of a scientifically enlightened and determined body of women. Critics who think that such studies are beneath the dignity of the college curriculum fail to see their scientific character, or the range of the problem with which they deal.²

These studies are primarily, but not exclusively, vocational. In so far as they contribute to an understanding of our civilization they are also comprehended in a truly broad conception of culture. Just as the study of education is of value not only for teachers, but for everyone, since everyone is indirectly interested in the educational currents of modern life, so it is with the study of business and household affairs. Our complex life brings us daily into situations where a proper understanding of these matters is of importance. The college, therefore, as the special school of liberal education, should include the advanced study of them in its curriculum.

² Domestic science is establishing itself in the college curriculum, frequently against ignorant and determined opposition. The most common objection is that ordinary home training is adequate. It is a sad fact that it is not. The domestic incompetency of many college-bred women, otherwise highly educated and agreeably cultured, is the cause of much more trouble than comes to the public view. The difficulty of managing domestic service is in many cases due quite as much to the inefficiency of the employer as to that of the employed. Generally speaking, a superintendent needs to understand the practical technique of his business, however little he engages in it,

APPENDIX D

GENERAL READING

What do college students read? In answer to this question we have the results of several investigations. College men commonly read the daily papers, paying more attention to sporting news than to other occurrences or to editorial comment. They distinctly prefer good newspapers, and shun "yellow journalism." They also read the prominent weeklies with regular interest, and to a less extent the monthly magazines. College women devote less time to daily and weekly newspapers. Not many students of either sex read books, except an occasional work of fiction, in addition to textbook study and other required reading. In general it appears that volumes of essays, history, poetry and biography receive little attention outside of regular courses.

It is asserted that college students read less serious literature than formerly; and it must be acknowledged that the increasing complexity of college life, with its engrossing social interests, tends to prevent them from reading anything except what is required. I doubt, however, whether the change is quite as great as is supposed. When we consider the development which has taken place in the curriculum and note that what formerly belonged to general reading—necessarily so if read at all—now has a home in this or that course of study; when we remember that the curriculum now includes modern literature, psychology, economics, and a dozen other subjects, some of which were almost unknown to the college student of a generation ago, we see that the decrease is more apparent than real. Broader requirements and improved library facilities have tended to increase the amount of "heavy" reading. Hence the inference that the diminution of gen-

eral reading implies a lack of intellectual interests is uncertain.¹

Yet we must acknowledge that there is too little general reading of a serious sort, especially in view of the unquestionable educational profit of such reading. Three considerations are important here. The first is that reading gives a broad acquaintance with life and culture, such as concentrated study cannot give. Of course mere bookishness in any form is undesirable, but as a means of information and as an adjunct of observation and reflection books are indispensable. The "well read" man has breadth of vision and of sympathy. Second, general reading creates a sound basis and background for more specialized and systematic study. No particular subject of investigation is complete in itself; every one has ramifications which touch other parts of life and experience; and in consequence an understanding of the latter, even a general and superficial understanding, helps in the more special pursuit. Third, the habit of general reading needs to be cultivated as a means of intellectual recreation throughout later life. No other form of recreation can take the place of this, especially in the lives of those who are compelled to spend much time alone. There is nothing which is so easy of attainment and at the same time so effective in withdrawing the mind into restful and agreeable fields as a book.

Yet the habit of general reading is not properly a substitute for regular study. In rare cases, no doubt, it happens that students graduate with only a distant acquaintance with the curriculum, but with an extraordinary breadth of information acquired in this way. In fact some great

¹The alleged change is probably exaggerated. Critics naturally recall for comparison their own more serious associations, which were perhaps somewhat exceptional. Furthermore, the casual smoke and table talk of a fraternity house in the presence of a visitor do not reliably indicate the intellectual atmosphere of the house itself, to say nothing of that of the college. The student who is independently digging into Carlyle, Browning, Emerson and others of like depth is inconspicuously buried in his study or in an alcove in the library. I suspect that he is more numerous than is commonly believed.

men have educated themselves by neglecting prescribed studies and devouring omnivorously all the books which interested them. The regular plan sometimes fails to meet the needs or accommodate itself to the special capabilities of the individual, and when this occurs one may more successfully follow a path of his own choosing. As a rule, however, general reading is too desultory to take the place of systematic study. In contrast with the latter it lacks method and vigor. Its proper functions are recreation, casual information, and a supplementary pursuit of specialized interests.

The abundance of current literature which surrounds us raises for the general reader a special problem of selection. We are newspaper-ridden, flooded with magazines, overwhelmed with books, and while most of this material is so inaccurate, repetitious and frivolous that it is not worth a glance, there is mixed with it a good deal of the best human thought and feeling. In consequence there is danger of waste of time and corruption of interest through inability to discriminate between the wheat and the chaff. How shall we select what is really worth reading?

There is no universal rule, of course, but the following suggestions may prove helpful to one who is working out his own solution of the difficulty. First, as regards newspapers, it is worth while to spend fifteen or twenty minutes daily upon one which has an established reputation for excellent news service and editorial wisdom. Some of its items are merely interesting in themselves; others, such as facts of contemporary politics, government, war, crime and social movements of various kinds, help us to form sound opinions about human life. It is necessary to skip almost everything with hardly a passing glance, but we are aided in this by news indexes, headlines, initial paragraphs, and editorial summaries. As a rule nothing is to be read through,—not even the sporting page! Our newspaper reading should be a daily exercise in sifting the wheat from the chaff, the events of real import from these that are trivial. Weekly newspapers and magazines deserve more leisurely attention. Their content of carefully selected news and wise editorial comment is genuinely edu-

cational. Half a dozen of them might be named as our most reliable source of instruction with regard to current events; and the practice of reading one or two with regularity is more profitable than that of devoting the same amount of time to daily papers.

The welter of monthly magazines in more or less glaring covers presents its own problem of selection, for while most of them contain nothing worth reading there are some which offer us excellent fiction and valuable articles, often the work of authorities and experts, upon various phases of contemporary life.² The variety and compactness of their contents make them especially convenient for general reading, but this quality involves a subtle danger of over indulgence and loss of the power of sustained interest. Indeed the most serious criticism of magazine reading is that it tends to unfit us for reading in a steadily progressive way. We grow to look upon a book with impatience, and desire all our literature in the form of pills. Or, to change the figure, magazine reading is like giving a light tap to several nails instead of repeated blows to one; the result is that none of them is driven in far enough to stick. We finish the ten or twelve pages of an article quickly, turn to something else, and straightway forget.

The "short story habit" is particularly to be avoided. The development of this type of fiction has become a positive menace to the faculty of steady, sustained appreciation. Its skillful holding of the attention, its addiction to dramatic, swiftly moving incident instead of the deeper currents of human nature, its very completeness in itself, tend to produce a corresponding mental attitude in the reader—a nervous attitude which hurries to the conclusion and becomes incapable of leisurely, thoughtful, character-building friendship with books. He glances and forgets, almost as he passes the multitude of faces in the street. The safest rule in dealing with magazines, and especially with magazine fiction, seems to be that of strictly limiting the time which one devotes to them.

² Professor William James once referred to three of them and a weekly newspaper as a "popular university" of instruction in human nature. See *The Social Value of the College-Bred*.

With respect to books the counsel of perfection that we read only the best fails to throw much light upon our difficulty. The mass of classical and contemporary literature is so great, and the amount of the best is so far beyond our powers, that the problem of selection remains. Choice may be facilitated, however, by the advice of a librarian or of instructors, by consulting book reviews in the newspapers and magazines, by reference to the standard lists which books about libraries and reading often contain, and by taking advantage of the small "selected libraries" which shrewd librarians sometimes obtrude upon the wayfarer's attention in the reading room. A list of "books which everyone should read" is likely to express only the personal taste of the compiler, a taste perhaps sound enough in itself, but not authoritative for others. With these more general aids the reader may safely be left to his own discoveries; in half an hour of browsing he will reach more good books than he has time to read.

The use of selected libraries shows a predominant fondness for fiction and a relative neglect of history, biography, poetry and travel. A modern novel, in fact, receives for a while almost incessant reading. Unfortunately this sort of well written, superficially interesting story weakens the power of voluntary attention without offering any considerable revelation of life; the tale is simply fascinating, rapidly skimmed, and instantly forgotten. In contrast, the journey of the explorer, the development of a people or of an individual, and the delicate expression of feeling in verse are likely to seem dull and tedious. Yet the pleasurable habit of more solid general reading is not difficult to acquire, especially if we take pains to keep a good book within easy reach, and to pick it up frequently. And there can be no doubt as to which kind of literature produces the more lasting satisfaction. The latter lives, the current fiction dies, and it is much the same with their respective effects upon us.

A final rule for the general reader is that of reading thoughtfully. This does not necessarily mean slowly. General reading ought of course to be much more rapid than the study of a textbook. But it is possible to ac-

quire a speedy habit of picking out important ideas, comparing and criticizing, with the result that the substance of what is read enters by the process of mental digestion into the permanent structure of the mind. On the other hand we now and then find readers devouring immense quantities of literature and deriving little or nothing from it—no subjects of conversation, no useful information, no power of thought. Such reading is simply their way of wasting time. A good test of our skill and of the value of what we read is that of questioning ourselves about significant points. Even our recreational reading of fiction ought as a rule to give us a more reflective understanding of human nature; it is often worth while to dwell in retrospect upon the story which we have just finished. When we find ourselves so weary of mind that we lose our thoughtful grasp and the sentences become more or less meaningless strings of words, when we impatiently hurry to the end without caring about what we pass, it is time to stop. The two main requirements of general reading are that it should make our leisure thoughtful and enjoyable.

APPENDIX E

(From a card of advice to students in the library of
Brown University:)

“Every student who aspires to culture should have read before graduation as many as possible of the chief masterpieces of the world’s literature. The following are offered as a selection:

Bible: Job; Psalms; Isaiah, 40-66; Mark; Apocalypse.

Homer: Iliad; Odyssey.

Aeschylus: Dramas.

Sophocles: Dramas.

Euripides: Selected Dramas.

Aristophanes: Comedies.

Plato: Selected Dialogues.

Demosthenes: Orations.

Vergil: Aeneid

Cicero: Orations; Selections.

Horace: Poems.

Plutarch: Selected Lives

Marcus Aurelius: Meditations.

Arabian Nights.

Beowulf.

Nibelungenlied.

Song of Roland.

Omar Khayyám: Rubáiyát, translated by FitzGerald.

Dante: Divine Comedy.

Chaucer: Canterbury Tales.

Montaigne: Essays.

Cervantes: Don Quixote.

Spenser: Faerie Queene.

Bacon: Essays.

Shakespeare: Dramas; Poems.

- Milton: Poems.
Molière: Selected Dramas.
Bunyan: Pilgrim's Progress.
Defoe: Robinson Crusoe; Selections.
Swift: Gulliver's Travels; Selections.
Fielding: Tom Jones.
Goldsmith: Vicar of Wakefield; Plays; Poems.
Burke: Speeches.
Goethe: Faust; Hermann and Dorothea; Selections.
Schiller: Dramas; Poems.
Wordsworth: Selected Poems.
Scott: Novels; Selected Poems.
Lamb: Essays.
Webster: Speeches.
Byron: Childe Harold; Selected Poems.
Shelley: Selected Poems.
Keats: Poems.
Carlyle: French Revolution; Sartor Resartus; Selections.
Macaulay: History of England; Essays.
Hugo: Les Misérables; Selections.
Emerson: Essays; Poems.
Hawthorne: Novels and Tales.
Poe: Poems; Selected Tales.
Tennyson: Selected Poems.
Thackeray: Novels.
Dickens: Novels.
Browning: Selected Poems.
Thoreau: Week; Cape Cod; Walden.
Lowell: Biglow Papers; Selected Poems and Essays.
Arnold: Poems; Essays.
Ibsen: Dramas.
Tolstoi: War and Peace; Anna Karénina; Selections.
Swinburne: Selected Poems.

APPENDIX F

CONSTITUTION OF THE STUDENT COUNCIL OF X—— COLLEGE

ARTICLE I

There is hereby constituted a Council to be known as the Student Council of X—— College.

ARTICLE II

The object of this Council shall be:

Section I—To furnish a representative body of students who, by virtue of their position and influence in student affairs, shall be able to express the opinion and wishes of the undergraduates.

Section II—To encourage student activities, to make regulations for the conduct and control of the same, and to decide matters of difference between student organizations, in so far as the exercise of these functions does not conflict with College legislation.

Section III—To provide a suitable medium through which student opinion may be presented to the College authorities.

ARTICLE III

Section I—The Council shall consist of six regular members and two advisory members.

Section II—The term of office shall be one year.

ARTICLE IV

Section I—To be eligible for regular membership a student shall have spent five semesters in X—— College, or its equivalent in other collegiate institutions.

Section II—To be eligible for advisory membership a student shall have spent three semesters in X—— College, its equivalent in other collegiate institutions.

Section III—To be eligible for either regular or advisory membership a student shall be in good college standing, i.e., not in arrears of college requirements of scholarship or under college discipline.

ARTICLE V

Section I—Six weeks before the end of the academic year the Council as a nominating committee shall submit to the Student Body the names of twelve students eligible for regular membership and the names of four students eligible for advisory membership.

Section II—Upon petition signed by twenty per cent. of the Student Body and presented within ten days after the publication of the list of Council nominees the Council shall add to the list the name or names indicated in the petition.

ARTICLE VI

Section I—The names included in the list of nominees shall be voted upon by the Student Body in an election held three weeks before the end of the academic year.

Section II—The new Council shall take office on Commencement Day following its election.

Section III—The Council shall have the power to fill any vacancy arising in its membership between elections.

ARTICLE VII

Section I—The officers of the Council shall be a President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer.

Section II—The officers of the Council shall be elected by a majority vote of the Council at its first meeting.

Section III—The President, in addition to the regular duties of that office, shall preside over the meetings of the Student Body.

Section IV—The Secretary-Treasurer, in addition to the regular duties of that office, shall have in charge the minutes and funds of the Student Body.

ARTICLE VIII

The Council shall have the right to confer with the Administration of the College on matters of peculiar interest and importance to the Student Body.

ARTICLE IX

Section I—The Council shall have the power to make such legislation of student conduct and control of student activities as is, in its judgment, for the welfare of the College.

Section II—Upon petition of twenty per cent. of the Student Body any legislation passed by the Council shall be submitted to the Student Body for acceptance or rejection.

Section III—Upon petition of twenty per cent. of the Student Body the Council shall submit to the Student Body for acceptance or rejection any proposed legislation set forth in the petition.

ARTICLE X

The Council shall have the authority, and it shall be its duty to take into consideration, on its own motion or on charges preferred, the conduct of any student or body of students which may seem detrimental to the welfare of the College; and having conducted an investigation shall itself take, or where necessary recommend to the proper authorities such action as it deems just and reasonable in order that such conduct may be properly punished and any repetition of it prevented.

ARTICLE XI

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the Student Body. An amendment may be proposed by a majority of the Council or by one-third of the Student Body. Such amendment shall be posted not less than ten days before being voted on by the Student Body.

APPENDIX G

THE CREED OF A COLLEGE CLASS

(Hyde, *The College Man and the College Woman*, pp. 173, 174)

"I believe in one God, present in nature as law, in science as truth, in art as beauty, in history as justice, in society as sympathy, in conscience as duty, and supremely in Christ as our highest ideal.

I believe in the Bible as the expression of God's will through man; in prayer as the devotion of Man's will to God; and in the church as the fellowship of those who try to do God's will in the world.

I believe in worship as the highest inspiration to work; in sacrifice as the price we must pay to make right what is wrong; in salvation as growth out of selfishness into service; in eternal life as the survival of what loves and is lovable in each individual; and in judgment as the obvious fact that the condition of the gentle, the generous, the modest, the pure, and the true is always and everywhere preferable to that of the cruel, the sensual, the mean, the proud, and the false."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, *Three Phi Beta Kappa Addresses*, Houghton.
Baird, *Manual of American College Fraternities*.
Benton, *The Real College*, Jennings and Graham.
Birdseye, *Individual Training in Our Colleges*, Macmillan.
Birdseye, *Reorganization of Our Colleges*, Baker and Taylor.
Boswell, *Aims and Defects of College Education*, Putnam.
Briggs, *Routine and Ideals*, Houghton.
Briggs, *School, College and Character*, Houghton.
Briggs, *Girls and Education*, Houghton.
Butler, *The Meaning of Education*, Macmillan.
Canby, *College Sons and College Fathers*, Harper.
Canfield, *The College Student and His Problems*, Macmillan.
Cooper, *Why Go to College?*, Century.
Corbin, *Which College for the Boy?*, Houghton.
Corbin, *An American at Oxford*, Houghton.
Cramer, *Talks to Students on the Art of Study*, Doubleday.
Crawford, *The American College*, Holt.
Crawford, *The College Girl of America*, Page.
Dearborn, *How to Learn Easily*.
Eliot, *Educational Reform*, Century.
Eliot, *University Administration*, Houghton.
Eliot, *Education for Efficiency*, Houghton.
Eliot, *Durable Satisfactions of Life*, Crowell.
Essays for College Men, Holt.
Fitch, *The College Course and the Preparation for Life*, Houghton.
Flexner, *The American College*, Century.
Foster, *The Administration of the College Curriculum*, Houghton.
Fulton, *College Life*, Macmillan.
Gilman, *University Problems*, Century.

Gulick, *The Efficient Life*, Dodd.

Gulick, *Mind and Work*, Dodd.

Harper, *The Trend in Higher Education*, Univ. of Chicago Press.

Hart, *Studies in American Higher Education*, Longmans.

Hyde, *The College Man and the College Woman*, Houghton.

Jordan, *College and the Man*, American Unitarian Assoc.

Jordan, *The Care and Culture of Men*, Whittaker and Ray.

Jordan, *The Voice of the Scholar*, Paul Elder.

Kitson, *How to Use Your Mind*, Lippincott.

Koopman, *The Mastery of Books*, Putnam.

Lockwood, *The Freshman and His College*, Heath.

McMurry, *How to Study*, Houghton.

Newman, *The Idea of a University*, Longmans.

Palmer, *The Teacher*, Houghton.

Present College Questions, Appleton.

Rice, *College and the Future*, Scribner.

Sargent, *Physical Education*.

Sargent, *Health, Strength and Power*.

Sharpless, *The American College*, Doubleday.

Sheldon, *Student Life and Customs*, Appleton.

Slosson, *Great American Universities*, Macmillan.

Snow, *The College Curriculum*, Columbia University.

Talbot, *Education of Women*, Univ. of Chicago Press.

Thwing, *American Colleges, Their Students and Their Work*, Hinds.

Thwing, *A History of Higher Education in America*, Appleton.

Thwing, *College Administration*, Century.

Thwing, *College Training and the Business Man*, Appleton.

Thwing, *The American College*, Platt and Park.

Thwing, *The American College in American Life*, Putnam.

Thwing, *The College Woman*, Baker and Taylor.

Thwing, *Within College Walls*, Baker and Taylor.

West, *American Liberal Education*, Scribner.

Wilson, *Working One's Way Through College*, McClurg.

Wright, *From School to College*, Yale Press.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

JUN 9 1949

SEP 19 1949

NOV 4 1955

FEB 21 1958

APR 25 1961

MAY 17 1961

JUN 14 1965

JUL 23 1965

JUN 18 1969

JUN 3 1969

ED. / PSYCH.
LIBRARY

SUBJECT TO FINE IF NOT RETURNED TO
EDUCATION LIBRARY

NOV 11 1980

RECEIVED

NOV 10 '80 -4 PM

ED/PSYCH LIB.

UCLA-ED/PSYCH Library

LB 2321 E94c



L 005 595 987 8

Education
Library

LB
2321
E94c

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 001 006 044 0

